

CITIZENS TO BE

UNIFORM WITH THIS VOLUME

By E. G. A. HOLMES
WHAT IS AND WHAT
MIGHT BE
[New Edition in preparation]

IN DEFENCE OF WHAT
MIGHT BE *5s. net*

THE TRAGEDY OF
EDUCATION *2s. 6d. net*

By DOROTHY CANFIELD FISHER
A MONTESSORI MOTHER
[Third Impression. 5s. net]

MOTHERS AND CHILDREN
[Second Impression. 5s. net]

SELF-RELIANCE; Practical
Methods of Developing Initiative and
Responsibility in the Young.
4s. 6d. net

CONSTABLE & COMPANY LTD.

CITIZENS TO BE

A SOCIAL STUDY OF HEALTH, WISDOM AND
GOODNESS WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE
TO ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

BY

M. L. V. HUGHES

LATE EXHIBITIONER OF SOMERVILLE COLLEGE, OXFORD

WITH A PREFACE BY

J. H. MUIRHEAD, M.A., LL.D.

PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM

LONDON
CONSTABLE AND COMPANY
LIMITED

“The didactic Art has to be studied in the interests of Parents, Teachers, Pupils, the Commonwealth, the Church, and Heaven.”

*First published, July 1915.
Reprinted, September 1917*

FOREWORD

THE effort of these pages is a threefold effort of reconciliation—first, to suggest a closer fellowship between the company of social workers and the company of teachers, and to win a wider recognition of the identity of the aims of both; secondly, within the educational ideal, to unite the often contrasted purposes of vocational and liberal, primary and secondary, individual and civic, secular and religious education; thirdly, to foreshadow the attainment, hastened through such a fellowship and such an education, of wider and deeper life-unities—the merging of the ideals of aristocracy and democracy in a better social order, and the fulfilment of the national ideal in the international, as Humanism pursues its inevitable upward course towards its own transcendence. The conviction compelling the effort is that the realisation of these several purposes is to be sought either in their reconciliation or nowhere. And if the attempt to comprehend so much within a single aim is daring, yet it is not so reckless, in view of the whole Humanist tradition, as the attempt to work or think on these matters in isolation.

My thanks are due to Mr. Seebohm Rowntree, to Professor J. A. Green (Sheffield University), to Professor J. H. Muirhead, Miss Fry, Miss Lilley and Miss Field (Birmingham University), to the

Clerk of the Glasgow School Board, to members of the Birmingham Education Committee and Central Care Committee, to the Head Teachers of many schools, to my Father, and to a great number of friends and critics, for their most generous help, both in providing facilities for practical experience in Schools, Training Colleges and Settlements, and in reading and commenting on the various chapters.

M. L. V. H.

January 6, 1915.

PREFACE

I

WHEN towards the end of July last year I was reading the manuscript of this book in a quiet sea-side place in Devon, I found myself vaguely wondering whether conflict was really possible between the ideal of life and education it sets before us and any other. I had not finished reading it when war broke out between ourselves and Germany, and set all doubt on that score at rest. With so many others I saw at once that what we had before us was a life-and-death struggle between this ideal and another which, in the latter half of the nineteenth century, had been silently growing up in the central power of Europe and usurping its place. On the one hand, the disinterested development of the powers of the individual, to the end of giving him his place in a community of free and equal citizens with an outlook beyond to a world-order of like communities; on the other, community truly, and self-surrender of individuals to their place and duties in it, but a community narrowed down to a particular nation and state, carrying with it the regimentation of powers and the subordination of will to the end of its own particular purpose of racial predominance. On the one hand, adjustment

through the free development of parts, natural articulation, toleration and co-operation; on the other, suppression, malformation, exclusion, domination. It was clear that the war was passing judgment on these two ideals, and that, when it was over, men and nations would be called on as never before to make up their minds which has the promise of the future within it. In this country, at least, it cannot be doubtful what the verdict must be. It will remain only to stand firmly by the verdict, and to insist on its significance for mankind. But it was equally clear that the matter could not end there, and that the same events which were passing judgment on general theories of education were also passing judgment on practices; and we shall wholly lose the value of their teaching if we fail to apply the lesson to ourselves. Granted that in the lurid light of the war the features of these two contrasted systems are set before us in outlines it is impossible any longer to mistake, it is not less certain that the failures and successes of each in its own field are being written in fire. We are concerned with our own, and the question that these events are pressing upon us with a new searchingness is, how far we have lived up to our own ideal, how far it has actually embodied itself in our national system and permeated the daily work of our schools.

II

That our national system, primary or secondary, has been as a whole a failure, as some writers of

authority have alleged,¹ it is impossible on any large view to admit. Those who have lived, as I have, through the last half century, with any fair degree of contact with different classes, must be conscious of the profound effect for the better of the educational reforms that have taken place during that period. Whether we look to the Universities, the old public and grammar schools, the new high schools for boys and girls, or the provided and non-provided elementary schools, higher, lower and infants, there is unmistakable evidence of a new spirit of disinterested devotion to the ideal of the free development of capacity best summed up in the word Humanism. To take elementary education alone, which is the chief object of criticism, there can be no doubt whatever of the immense difference it has made in the life of the people. Apart from it, the great social and economic improvement which the last half century has witnessed would have been impossible. The great fabrics of Trade Unionism, Co-operative Societies, Friendly Societies, religious brotherhoods, if they had existed at all, would have been built of untempered mortar. The development of intelligence, which is at once cause and effect of these organisations, has enabled the working classes to take hold of their lives and reap the advantage of their new opportunities to a degree which some of us at the beginning hardly dared to hope. For the *élite* of them it has made new educational movements like that of the Workers' Educational Association the bright possibility it already is. Even in the lower ranks of industry there is abundant evidence of a new spirit

¹ See Chap. I, p. 3 below.

as the direct result of awakened intelligence. We have heard a great deal recently of unemployed, unemployable, and under-employed; and social reformers have not been slow to use this disorganisation to give point to their criticism of the schools. But there is another side even to this. The cry has gone up from the workers themselves, and in the vast majority of cases expresses a genuine desire for the opportunity of exercising powers of hand and brain which better education has developed in them, and which demand an outlet. I do not think it is too much to say that we are witnessing the end of the hopeless inertia, work-shyness and aimless vagrancy which used to be regarded as so large a factor in the social problem, and that this result is largely due to the new education.

Coming to the war itself, and comparing things as they are to-day with their condition even so recently as in the Boer War, there can be no doubt whatever as to the immense improvement that has taken place. An American writer in the *Times* of March 22 of the present year appealed to the absence of excitement and of all "mafficking" as evidence that the masses in England were not taking the war as seriously as they might. It did not seem to occur to him that it might, on the contrary, be proof of the increase of intelligence and power of self-restraint in the presence of great issues that has taken place in the new generation. From another side we have heard much of the increase of intemperance among soldiers' dependants resulting from the liberal scale of separation allowances. But here also there is much unimpeachable evidence to show that the most outstanding feature of the

present situation as compared with that half a generation ago is the marked improvement that has taken place.¹

While the national system, by its initial impulse, has been carried to these results, reformers have been growingly conscious that it falls very far short not only of what it might achieve, but of what has already been achieved elsewhere under circumstances even less favourable than our own. It still leaves lamentable gaps, resulting not only in the loss of talent to the nation, but in the loss of the elements of talent and character already developed—most fatal of all, the gap between the influences of school and those of responsible manhood. It still leaves far too much to chance in the development particularly of the social and civic sense, without which true humanistic feeling must remain vague and ineffective. Worst of all, while professing to aim at thoughtfulness, individuality, power of initiative, it stolidly refuses to provide in the schools the space and quiet, the leisure, and the opportunity of individual treatment of the scholars, which are the prime condition of the development of these things. Turning to the present crisis of the war, it is not too much to say that it is the corresponding defects of character, in sections or in the mass of the nation, which are the chief sources of danger at the present moment. It would indeed be wholly unfair to blame the schools for the ravages which the twin demons of drink and sexual licence are committing in national efficiency, both in the work-

¹ As chairman of one of the Citizens' Committees in a typical district of Birmingham I have made careful inquiries and found a remarkable unanimity on this head.

shop and the camp. But the experience of the fatal effect of the additional temptations to selfish indulgence which the war has supplied among men and women alike must have opened the eyes of many to the failure of our system to do all it might have done at the critical period of adolescence to guard against it. It would be equally unfair to saddle the schools with responsibility for the disputes between labour and capital, which at the present moment are endangering the success of our arms, but no denunciations of the economic system ought to blind us to the failure of our educational system, from the Universities downwards, to create in an industrial nation that sense of being engaged through our manufactures and commerce in a great common enterprise of civilisation which alone can lend unity and dignity to national life under modern conditions. The lack of thoughtfulness, adaptability, and power of initiative is a subtler defect, which is only likely to reveal itself to those who are in close contact with the life of the people. But amongst these there is a widespread suspicion that all is not well with the classes chiefly concerned, and that in the unparalleled circumstances which the course of the war will inevitably bring with it this failure must manifest itself in still more fatal forms.

III

It is this mixture of success and failure which constitutes the unique call to teachers and administrators at the present time. It calls first and foremost for a clearer and more imaginative grasp of

what is implied in the educational faith in which as a nation we profess to believe. The articles of this faith have often been stated, but never before with the same illuminating comment. If educational reformers lose the opportunity now offered them, they will have themselves to blame if they are condemned to impotence for a generation. But this is only half the story. The other half is the call for a more effective organisation of resources and a closer application of recognised principles to school methods. It is all the more important to emphasise this on account of the danger that, in the reaction against all things German, we fail to catch the true import of what is passing before our eyes. The conflict is not, as it has been represented, between real culture and organised efficiency.¹ Efficiency is not an ideal but a method. There is an efficient way of getting to heaven as well as getting anywhere else. What is wrong is not the efficiency of German methods, but the end for which they are used. The task before us is precisely the union of "organised efficiency on the largest scale" with a truer, because more comprehensive, ideal of the end of education. This is not the place to suggest the details of such an organisation. I refer the reader to the chapters in this book which deal with them. I would here merely add a word or two in reply to a criticism which is sure to be made.

It will be said that, true and important as all this is, it is not the time to press it in speech or writing. One of the chief lessons of the war, it is generally held, has been the unpreparedness in which we were

¹ e. g. by Bishop Welldon in *School World*, February 1915, p. 42.

caught at the outset, and for which the vague Humanism that has hampered patriotic effort in the past is largely responsible. After the war, moreover, we may be sure there will everywhere be a call for the strictest economy, and the country will be in no mood for increased expenditure on education. I believe that these arguments, so far from deterring, ought to act as an incentive to reformers to make themselves articulate. With regard to the first, I am prepared to agree that things are no longer what they were. The old policy of splendid isolation, I believe, is no longer possible. With the rise of great democratic nations sharing the same ideals, new obligations have arisen for each—more particularly that of enforcing treaties and maintaining public law in the common interest. If, as may be hoped, the more advanced nations more and more recognise the necessity of organising themselves for this purpose, England will have to play her full part in the future policy of the world. This will not mean the acceptance of the continental system of conscription; but it may mean some form of universal compulsory military training in schools and colleges, factories, businesses and warehouses. If this comes to pass in an educational atmosphere imperfectly permeated with humanistic ideas, there may be a real danger of fostering the military spirit. There is only one effective way of meeting this danger—to complete the permeation. This is the answer to those who would have Humanists lie low at the present juncture.

The argument for economy in education admits of a no less conclusive reply. There never has been a time when interest, patriotism and honour alike

may more justly be pleaded in support of a generous endeavour to remedy the deficiencies of our educational system. With the unexampled destruction of life and property entailed by the war, there will come an unexampled call to make the most of the brains and hands of the coming generation, whose task it will be to replace the loss. One of the most consoling and promising results of the conflict has been the amount of care that the new maternity committees throughout the country have been encouraged to expend upon the infant population; and it would be the merest folly and extravagance to permit the advantage that it is thus hoped to secure to be lost to the country by adopting a cheese-paring policy at the next stage of the process of citizen-making.

These are business considerations. But there lies against the nation a debt of honour which it has no better opportunity of repaying than just here. The working classes, at least equally with others, have stood between the country and destruction; and it is the very least that the country can do to see that a more generous share of the civilisation for which it stands shall fall to the lot of their children. But even though these arguments were to fall on deaf ears, and we are on the verge of a period of mistaken economy in the schools, this is no reason why reformers should relax their efforts. It will only be an additional reason to press the need to make the best of the means and material to hand by cutting away all survivals and superfluities in our present methods, and concentrating on the main objects of a humane education. I have heard it said on the best authority that the unwillingness

of County Councils to spend more generously on education, even now, is the result far more of a not ungrounded suspicion of the shortcomings of the instruction that is actually being given than of any half-heartedness in the cause of education. So far as this is the case, the remedy is in the hands of teachers themselves.

As a summons to well-directed effort in removing this reproach, and thus opening the way to new developments, I know nothing in educational literature more useful than the chapters which follow.

J. H. MUIRHEAD.

Birmingham,
March 30, 1915.

CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
	FOREWORD	v
	PREFACE BY PROFESSOR J. H. MUIRHEAD	vii
I	SOCIAL REFORM THROUGH EDUCATION	3
II	HUMANISM—NEW AND OLD	23
III	ADAPTABILITY AND FREEDOM	57
IV	HEALTH	75
V	CURRICULA—GENERAL PRINCIPLES	101
VI	CURRICULA—THE DIRECT AND INDIRECT VALUES	119
VII	CHARACTER, INTEREST AND CITIZENSHIP	181
VIII	LEISURE	215
IX	AFTERWARDS	249
X	HUMANISM AND THE WAR	271

APPENDIX A

NOTES ON HUMANIST EDUCATION	307
---------------------------------------	-----

APPENDIX B

THE BIRMINGHAM CARE COMMITTEE	311
INDEX	329

CHAPTER I

SOCIAL REFORM THROUGH EDUCATION

HUMANIST EDUCATION IN THE FIFTEENTH
CENTURY AND TO-DAY—

The Unchanged Ideal.

The Changed Conditions.

THE TWENTIETH-CENTURY APPLICATION OF
HUMANISM—

Its Democratic Extension.

Continuity of School and After-school
Life.

THE FIVE BRIDGES. PLAN OF THE FOLLOWING
CHAPTERS.

THE TEACHER'S THREE ALTERNATIVES.

THE TEACHER'S THREE PROBLEMS.

CHAPTER I

SOCIAL REFORM THROUGH EDUCATION

“Schoolmasters, when they are such as they ought to be, have it in their power to new model and set right (by God's blessing) once in twenty years a whole kingdom.”—*Seventeenth Century Writer*.

EARLY in the fifteenth century Vittorino's school at Mantua could be described as “a sanctuary of manners, deeds and words”; it also achieved what would now be regarded as miracles of erudition; and it gave scrupulous care, in a careless age, to the physical health of the scholars. Thus it realised conspicuously the triple ideal of health, wisdom and goodness for which Humanist Education stands.

On the first Tuesday of the year 1914 it was possible for the *Times Educational Supplement* to print in large type above Mr. Sibley's letter “The Failure of Elementary Education.” And it was possible for Mr. Sibley to cite in support of the condemnation “Sir John Gorst, Sir William Anson, Sir Philip Magnus, Principal Griffiths, Mr. E. Holmes—late Chief Inspector of Elementary Schools—the late Commissioners on the Poor Law, and gentlemen appointed by the Board of Education to investigate the efficiency of elementary schools in Lancashire,” and also, indirectly, Dr. Sadler. Outside our own country it is possible for an educationist to assert that by the schools the

scholars are "impoverished for life,"¹ and again to cite grave witnesses. Every reader, whether himself supporting the condemnation or rejecting it, can assuredly cite others who, from competent knowledge and experience, do support it. Nevertheless of all the schools, of all grades, known to the writer, the two which most vividly recall Vittorino's ideal are Elementary Schools—one singularly favoured in external environment, the other an Infant School in a slum. These are, by common consent, exceptional. How may the type be made normal?

Vittorino's school was mainly for the sons of noblemen, and limited to seventy. The modern Elementary School is the people's school, and is not limited even to one thousand. On the other hand, Vittorino taught in an age of rude manners, and he taught in the face of daunting difficulty as regards textbooks. Supposing his ideal to be ours, the difficulties in the path of realisation are perhaps not very unequal. Only it is time, and more than time, to deal drastically with the most radical difference in the conditions—with the question of numbers. It is a double question—for how many are we to claim in its entirety the educational ideal? And how many can in plain fact be so educated in a single school or a single class? The second question, which is one of practical organisation, expenditure and method, as well as of principle, will be answered more soundly and more speedily when the first is answered.

To claim for the many exactly that triple Humanist ideal which the Greeks and the men of

¹ Ellen Key, *The Century of the Child*.

the Renaissance claimed for the few, this surely is the tendency of living, active thought to-day, forcing itself through obstructing masses of prejudice and apathy; and this surely is to be the distinctive contribution of our own age to education. It demands a national system, undoubtedly, and therefore some clear and accepted theory of the State's function, such as we do not in England possess. But, so far from demanding uniformity, the Humanist ideal demands an exacting measure of individualism—a difference of application in every school and for every scholar, according to the character and life-plan of each. And herein lies our supreme difficulty, to reconcile universality and individuality. We shall face it and surmount it when we believe that the final purpose of the individual, and that of the larger society which includes him, are identical.

Thus far, then, the appeal is to every teacher in every type of school for acceptance, deliberate and conscious and whole-hearted, of the old ideal of Humanism; and of that new and extended application which Humanism itself demands of this age. Without such acceptance our talk of a national system is idle. And the appeal is made in the conviction that both Secondary and Elementary Schools will benefit beyond all calculation by accepting a common foundation in civic and social interest, and by recognising a social unity which is the basis of educational unity: that the former have much to give, but even more to gain, by the imparting of this civic and social character to their instruction, and that the latter can never safeguard even those utilitarian interests, which they are rightly deter-

mined to protect, except by including them in the wider Humanist scheme.

But because by far the greatest number of our scholars belong to Elementary Schools, not only is the difficulty more momentous in this area than elsewhere, but so also is the benefit and worth of any rightly-directed change. The sheer size and urgency of the social need, which is our real business as educators, in whatever grade we work, compels us to ground our highest hopes as well as our deepest fears on that system which is most comprehensive—therefore on the Elementary Schools. Moreover, apart from the question of the leaving age, the after-life of the Elementary scholar is, under present industrial conditions, in greater peril than that of the child from the Secondary School. For these reasons the appeal is made in yet stronger and more concentrated form to every teacher in an Elementary School.

We have heard the condemnation. Its essence seems to be the disconnection between school-instruction and the needs of the after-life of the child—the fact that at fourteen his life is sundered into two unrelated parts.¹ But such complete severance is, at any rate for our generation, an impossible conception. Science, philosophy, religion, common sense and plain fact with one voice deny it. Whether we plan for it or not, there is

¹ Compare, *e.g.* the following expressions of opinion published by Mr. Blair in his 1908-1909 Report to the London County Council Education Committee—the first by an Inspector, the second by a Head Mistress: "Of training children to be fit for their future lives we are not in a position to boast very much yet." "With a few exceptions the school curriculum does not, I think, fit our girls for their future lives."

continuity in the child's life. And, for good or for evil, the schools are being tested, not inside their own walls, but in the industrial world. Connection there must be; bridges there must be. It is ours to determine the character of the connection, the safety of the bridges. If the expert has not built them, with knowledge and deliberate purpose, then chance and the child must throw out what rotten planks they can find, and the child must cross. Does he never sink? Many of us have been reading with peculiar interest Mr. Paterson's book, *Across the Bridges*. The bridges of the title are material bridges of stone, spanning the Thames. But those which the book itself, and the living work of the Elementary Teacher, as conceived and practised by the writer, are even now helping to construct, are the life-bridges between school and the industrial world.

It is with these life-bridges, five in number, that the following chapters are concerned. It is a Humanist Education that is to build them (*Chapter II*). For it rests with the school, in the first place, to cherish or to stifle the essential quality of Humanism—that freedom and adaptability which is life (*Chapter III*). It rests with the school to protect or to injure the physical well-being of the children (*Chapter IV*); to give or to withhold instruction in things needful for human safety and efficiency, and in things needful for human happiness and worth (*Chapters V and VI*); to give or to withhold (deliberately or otherwise) training in right interests, sound character and good citizenship (*Chapter VII*). But the school which accepts this triple Humanist ideal of health, wisdom and

goodness, will inevitably extend its care beyond the walls and the hours of school, and hold itself rightly judged by the use made, in school-life and afterwards, of leisure (*Chapter VIII*). This extending of care is part of its ancient and unchanging bond; but it does not necessarily involve the extending of its own personal and direct control, and it must never involve an intolerable increase of the teacher's burden. When by Juvenile Labour Exchanges, After-Care Committees, social clubs, and many other like-minded agencies, the Humanist ideal is gaining allegiance in a wider field, the school's obligation consists chiefly in whole-hearted support, interest and co-operation. This extended view of education, "across the bridges" and into the heart of industrialism, is attempted in *Chapter IX*, in the light of which all the foregoing conclusions must be judged.

Lastly (*Chapter X*), we are to face again, in view of international upheaval, the measure of educational failure. We are to ask, how comes it that education can lead to anything but international peace, how comes it that, when war broke out, we were quickly confronted with acute social problems, some of which could only arise because, over large sections of the community, education had missed its mark? How comes it that our young recruits and our girls from the Elementary Schools have made necessary such organisations as Women Patrols, to maintain the standard of decency in our streets and to give to these girls the rudiments of right thinking? And how comes it that none of the acute social problems of this time can be adequately met, because of the shortage of efficient

workers? The army of volunteers is considerable, but does it fairly represent our Secondary Schools and Colleges? To future generations, asking, let us hope with incredulity, as they read of such emergency-measures as the Patrol-system, "What meant ye by this service?" we shall have to admit our double dishonour, that the service was indeed necessary, and that able volunteers in sufficient numbers were hard to find. Our Schools, it seems, have produced enough "failures" to constitute a public danger, but not enough devoted and efficient citizens to overcome it.

But again, we have heard the condemnation many times, "The failure of Elementary Education" is no new phrase. Lately we have heard it so often that we are in no danger of suffering from shock. Rather we are disposed to relegate it, even in the vivid and picturesque form in which Mr. Holmes has presented it,¹ to the mass of old, familiar, unhappy and inevitable things.

But, in all seriousness, is not disregard on the part of the teacher the one unjustifiable thing? For if there is failure, it is the result of disregard. And if now under the name of reform chaos seeks to bring order out of chaos, must not the voice of the expert, *i. e.* the whole teaching body, be heard above all others, if order is indeed to emerge? Granted it is a national concern, and the nation as a whole does exhibit concern, plentiful and chaotic concern, yet why is the voice of the expert of all voices the least audible, and the concern of the teacher the least apparent? Is it surprising if

¹ *What Is and What Might Be* and *The Tragedy of Education*, etc., by E. G. A. Holmes.

reform is long delayed? In so far as the teacher, the expert, is denied expression, he is blameless. But in so far as he is ignorant or apathetic, he is unpardonable.

For what is our position? Are we committed to a profession which is radically misdirected and ineffectual? A great weight of skilled opinion does explicitly assert this thing of us, and a great mass of popular sentiment, not skilled, but based on solid experience of results, does emphatically bear out the charge. Assuming that we have entered the profession not as livelihood but as life-work, we have three alternatives only—to deny the charge with sincerity (first understanding it), or to admit it and labour for reform, or to withdraw from the ranks.

As to the first, we cannot, as teachers, deny the charge except from a wide range of evidence outside the school as well as within, since the chief weight of the charge comes from outside, and is based on facts not of the school-life but of the after-life for which the school in its very nature professes to prepare. Others may deny the responsibility of the school for what happens afterwards and outside; but it is precisely we, as teachers, who cannot. There is no teacher living who would not subscribe to the eternal claim of his profession, that its work is equipment for life.

The difficulty rather lies here, in the need of conference between teachers, parents, employers and the outside world at large, for the reconciliation of what are at present hopelessly diverging definitions of life. There can be no national system of education without a national ideal of life, involving, as already urged, some steadier theory of the State and

its function in education than we possess. The thinking of the next decade must be, on these first principles, concentrated, rapid and intense. And the thinking of teachers pre-eminently, must be made available for active use. And even so, another generation of scholars will have passed through our elementary schools—another six million—to hand on to yet another the life-principles and life-habits of a system which is condemned by its results in the after-life of the Scholars.

But, once more on educational grounds, this itself is condemnation for the teacher also, unless he can maintain that the life-ideal of the school is true, but that the life-ideal of the industrial and commercial world refuses to come into line. Or again, he might fairly plead that the early leaving-age renders his work futile. This again is a sound defence, supposing that the conditions of the after-school life are in sober fact such as to counteract right education. These are, emphatically, the very points for conference, as now urged, between the school and the outside world, and notably between teachers, parents and employers; and in providing facilities for this lies one main path of serviceableness for the Care Committee.¹ For vital hindrances such as we have considered, arising after the school years and defeating their accomplished good, the burden of responsibility rests on other shoulders than the teacher's, provided he has made his protest clear and strong and reasonable and passionate. But for the protest—seeing that the lives of his children, which are his life-work, are at stake—as well as for the unflinching maintenance of the Humanist ideal

¹ See Chap. IX. and Appendix.

in school, the teacher is above all others responsible. At present, we must conclude that the facts do not allow any teacher to accept the first alternative by denying the charge of educational failure.

We come to the second alternative, which admits the justice of the condemnation of the Elementary School system, and thereby imposes on every teacher the labour of reform.

And at once, and for the justifying of every word that follows, it is desired to meet the three inevitable, invariable and most reasonable pleas of the teacher: "Our classes are impossibly large; we are not free; and we have no time."

All three are admitted. Is the conclusion acquiescence in failure?

The big class is universally admitted to be a stumbling-block in the way of reform. We have not to waste our time and breath in proving the evil; we have to remove it. As teachers, we have to use our united professional force until it is removed. The prime purpose of every Trade Union is to ensure fair and reasonable conditions of work for its members. The class of sixty is neither a fair nor reasonable condition. And no action of any Trade Union could be more justified than the most drastic measures of the National Union of Teachers to ensure the removal of this obstacle. But it is no matter of private or sectional benefit, but of interests which are vital to the whole educational system of our country, so that the sympathy and active help of the teaching profession as a whole ought to be enlisted.

Every school-day the best efforts of thousands of skilled workers are frustrated by this one wrongful

condition. Every school-day the interests, not of thousands, but millions, of children are sacrificed to it. Every school-day miracles of discipline and drill are accomplished by the more capable teachers, and ignoble tragedies enacted or endured by the less capable. The miracles are not the sort of miracle we are needing, and the tragedies ought not to happen in any school, and need not with classes of a reasonable size. Neither the so-called success nor the obvious failure is accomplishing education in any true sense. We need to make up our minds whether our Training Colleges exist for the production of teachers or of drill-sergeants. When the profession is convinced of itself and its own vocation, and when its leading organisations are really united on the basis of a common educational aim, then its representations, whether to the Local Education Authority or to the Government, will possess an invincible force. And the first, because the most urgent of such representations must be the necessity for reduced classes in the Elementary Schools. Even in its virtually sectional¹ character the National Union of Teachers could enumerate, in 1911, thirty-two definite achievements "for education," among which "reduction in the size of classes" to the present limit of sixty has an inconspicuous place as twentieth. In view of this published record, the prolonging of the class of sixty must be due not to the inability of teachers to win a hearing, but to their failure to recognise the supreme urgency of this particular

¹ By its constitution it includes teachers in every kind of school (as does the Teachers' Guild), and it has had since 1909 a Secondary Schools Committee.

reform, and to agree to subordinate to it, for the present, all agitation for improvement in personal status and prospects. No indignity at present suffered by the teacher in such matters as salary, poor outlook, cramping restrictions, can compare with the indignity done to him by the assumption that his work can be carried on in the present wholesale, herd-like fashion, almost all its finer issues ruled out by the gross fact of numbers and the disregard of individuality.

Throughout the following chapters we shall be compelled either to reiterate, or to assume, the plea for small classes, simply because every reform advocated depends on this one material condition—because, in a word, health, wisdom and goodness are not machine-made articles to be produced in millions, but, rather, individual plants to be cultivated. No discussion of educational reform is practical unless we can hope that in the near future—or, at least, within a fifteen- or twenty-year time-limit—this main condition can be secured. In our final chapter we shall return to this plain issue, from the point of view of the external authority, and the actual prospects of reform. Here, what we are condemning is the measure of professional acquiescence in the evil; and the challenge is to every teacher to accept his or her share of responsibility for it, and to work for its removal, not in some dim future, but before his or her time of active service expires.

But “we are not free.” This also is true—as true as it is to say that we are not perfect and we are not omniscient. Only it is less true this year than it was last year, and, if we choose, it will be less true

next year than it is now. Let the general tendency of central and local educational authority be watched through a decade, and tested in their special enactments; and let the general position of the teacher, whether Head or Assistant, be compared at both ends of the period—and the increasing tendency to an increasing freedom will not be denied. And truth lies not in the fixity of things, but in their progress; not in some stereotyped, case-hardened school with the stamp of death even now upon it, but in the school whose life-breath is freedom and whose daily routine is daily experiment. Therefore, even though to-day the proportion of schools of the second type, compared with schools of the first type, were as one to ten—and the proportion is not so—truth would lie with the second, with the progressives, because “we are not free” is less true than “we are becoming free.”

But even to the faulty present and the fearful past let the teacher be fair. “The system,” supposed to be of an iron uniformity, has in fact produced schools differing from each other as light from darkness. They differed, as they still differ, according to the measure in which they themselves, and not the system, chose the Humanist ideal. And the Renaissance, that great light of freedom shining out of great darkness, is a historical fact, and not an isolated fact. Always there have been lesser lights—facts also—and admitting these, we cannot admit that individuality is ever helpless in the bonds of system. Or, once more, if we do seriously assert it in our own case, how comes it that we are teachers? Ours was the third alternative, to withdraw.

The other plea, "we have no time," is quite as frequent and more plausible. As things are, it is emphatically true. What then, in view of a fact so stubborn, should be our attitude, our purpose, our plan of work?

This, surely: "We have no time" for non-essentials. All of it must be spent in the learning and the fulfilling of the supreme requirements of education, as handed down by the great stream of living, Humanist thought.¹ "We have no time"; therefore we protest against every half-hour that is wasted through ignorance of the first principles of our profession. We have no time for work that possesses only mechanical worth, nor, on the other hand, for experiments without a guiding aim. We are compelled to use the thought and labour of those who in all ages have dealt efficiently with our own living problems. We have no time to give to lesser, superficial thought, or trivial formulæ which conceal the principles. It is the principles themselves that are to us as essential as the air we breathe. By our reading, by our training, by our practice, we must reach these; we must give our time to these—if need be, all our time.

"We have no time," in the curriculum itself, for much that is, reasonably and unreasonably, demanded of us. Therefore our first and last obligation is to make time for the subjects that most serve the Humanist ideal—for adequate instruction in those practical, manual and domestic subjects on which the social happiness, health and self-respect of the coming generation must depend; and, on the other hand, for generous training, through

¹ See Chap. II.

literature and art, in appreciation of the ultimate good of life. For the sake of these things we must scrutinise our Time Tables again and yet again, for the "elimination of lumber," remembering that the valuable things of one generation may be the educational lumber of the next.

And again "we have no time" through sheer obstacles of organisation which compel us to waste it, in vast quantities, in wearisome and endless repetition. We are given a class which is no class, but a perpetual flux, owing to the instability of its membership.¹ But even if the membership were steady, the excessive size of the class involves waste. And once more, since through these defects of organisation "we have no time" for the real claims of our profession, we demand the remedy long since agreed upon as necessary, the reduction of the numbers in each class.

"We have no time" in school. And out of school? Before the last Christmas holiday, when an entertainment was given in a very poor school for the Old Scholars' Club, two of the staff were in the building from 9 a.m. till 10 p.m. The instance is quoted as characteristic rather than as exceptional. There is no limit to the hours and the powers of service when love and loyalty are in command. And the "extras" are rightly felt by many teachers to be at least as much worth while as the necessary routine. If the cost is often great, the repayment is always abundant, in the transformation of the spirit of the community. All that has

¹ *i.e.* in England, where there are not, as in Scotland, fixed leaving days, but where the Authority, in spite of this, requires the numbers to be kept at a fixed level.

been proved true in this direction by the older and richer and more favoured schools of our country is simply waiting to be proved true also of the Elementary School. At present, it is true, there are teachers by whom every additional charge is made matter of querulous resentment—even the filling up of a Juvenile Employment Card. And under present conditions of stress and strain the Head Teachers have good reason to discourage much voluntary work on the part of their staff. But with the removal of the wrong conditions the ranks of volunteers will not be found deficient for any helpful enterprise, while the spirit of the volunteer will invade the whole of the “compulsory” system.

Once more “we have no time” in the school years to give an education worthy of the name. Therefore we plead for its extension, either in school or outside, beyond the age of fourteen for at least three years. Again, it is an accepted and recognised claim among all educationists, however different the methods they advocate; but it is we, as teachers, whose voice should be most clear and most insistent. We must ask, until we receive, “a national system of education” which does, indeed, require of us the preparation for complete living, but does not require us to condense every detail of it into nine driving years, and then frustrate our utmost achievement by a sudden and complete cessation.

And behind all other evils of the time-problem, and greater than them all, is the fact that often “we have no time” for self-education. As long as there are teachers too tired to read, too poor to travel,

too cumbered to know the meaning of leisure, so long is Humanism delayed. Every argument that has preceded gains its greatest force from this final and comprehensive one.

Thus, and at some length, the three pleas have had their hearing. If they are answered, our second alternative is shown to be reasonable and possible. Admitting the condemnation, we can labour for reform since already reform is on its way, its tracks are laid down, and it behoves us, as teachers and Humanists, to work for and identify ourselves with, not what *is*, but what *is becoming*, and most assuredly *shall be*.

For those who reject the first and the second, there is the third, and no other alternative. The teacher who disbelieves in the possibility of Humanism can only withdraw from the work and leave it to those who believe. Their number is growing. The fact of the present shortage of Elementary Teachers—six thousand to meet the annual demand for twelve thousand¹—does not refute this, but confirms it. What they are rejecting is not the Humanist ideal of teaching, but the actual present conditions, which render it impracticable for the average teacher in the average school. But the evidence is already abundant that it is not impracticable for the more favoured of the Elementary Schools, nor, in any school, for those rare teachers who by a combination of devotion and genius can defy the most untoward conditions.

¹ According to the calculation in an article by F. W. Goldstone, M.P., in the *Times Educational Supplement*, May 1914. More recently (February 1915) a Branch President of the National Union of Teachers gives the figures as 5000 (supply) and 14,000 (demand).

Our business is to hasten the amendment of conditions, so that what is now the rare achievement of the few may become the accepted standard of the many.

FOR REFERENCE

- Majority and Minority Reports of the Poor Law Commission*, 1909. Wyman.
- HELEN BOSANQUET. *The Poor Law Report of 1909*. Macmillan.
- ROWNTREE. *Poverty*. Macmillan.
- PATERSON. *Across the Bridges*. Arnold.
- WHITEHOUSE. *A National System of Education*. Cambridge University Press.
- BARON. *The Growing Generation*. Student Christian Movement, 93-94 Chancery Lane.
- SPENCER. *The Hope of the Redemption of Society*. Student Christian Movement, 93-94 Chancery Lane.
- HOLMES. *What Is and What Might Be*. Constable.
- „ *The Tragedy of Education*.
- LEONARD. *Education and the Social Problem*. Address to Workers' Educational Association.
- PRIDEAUX. *Survey of Elementary English Education*. Blackie. *Times Educational Supplement*, January 1914 and ff.
- BLAIR. *Report of the Education Officer to the London County Council, 1908-9 (including Memoranda on Educational Progress since 1870)*. King.
- Report of Conference of Educational Associations in London*, 1914, 1915. Secretary, 74 Gower Street.

CHAPTER II

HUMANISM—NEW AND OLD

- I. THE HUMANIST TRADITION.
- II. THE HUMANISTS—
 Their Nine Principles.
 Their Unity and Difference.
- III. HUMANISM TO-DAY.

CHAPTER II

HUMANISM—NEW AND OLD

"I would direct your attention to this : the further we extend our study of writers on education, the more are we struck with the substantial unity of opinion and object among the greatest of them."—LAURIE.

WE come straight to the teacher's most practical and most essential task—the selection out of chaos of the main consensus of opinion among great educators. All the more are we bound by our deficiency of time and of liberty to concentrate on this body of well-tried theory, and for the rest to avail ourselves thankfully of Mulcaster's advice in "a wise neglect of all unnecessary things."

The consensus is handed on in that stream of living thought which has been called "Humanism." A living stream it is, and not a precious relic in some museum. We may accept as permanently true Guarino's fifteenth-century definition of "humanitas"—"the pursuits, the activities, proper to mankind." But if this is indeed the meaning of Humanism, then Humanist Education must be for ever transforming its actual practice, even as those "pursuits and activities" are for ever in process of development. We can no more become Humanists by blind imitation, even of the best, than we can step twice into the same water of the stream. Yet the stream is one, and Humanism is one. Its unity

is the unity of life, and its diversity is the diversity in which the life-ideal of every age must be expressed. As life changes and expands, so must educational practice. And the failures of Humanists are due in part to the comprehensiveness of the unchanging ideal, in part to the difficulty of right adaptation and needful change of expression in each age. Seeking to be true to the life-ideal, they have emphasised one element which seemed for the time imperilled, and have, for the most part unconsciously, neglected others. But a genuine Humanism is bound by its very nature to correct its own failures of omission from age to age. "Failures of omission" we deliberately call them, believing that the only commands of Humanism, as of Christianity, are of the positive order. "Love, and do what thou wilt." Awaken right interest, and set it free. But defect of love, which is defect of interest, is ever guilty of omissions. And the work of educators in every age is first to reassert the ideal of Humanism—equipment by education for free and complete social life, based on enlarged social interest—and then to detect and supply practical omissions.

This means a looking back to the Humanists of past ages. But again it does not mean an imitation of them. Life, and therefore education, admits of no repetitions. Only the principles abide. The applications must be for ever new. To imitate, which is to copy the application, is to surrender the principle. For the principle is living, creative and original, requiring of every age a new incarnation. Therefore our only hope of being true to the spirit of great educators—of Plato, Vittorino, Erasmus,

Herbart—is to make our own contribution towards a new Renaissance, and, having looked back, to look forward.

The backward look, such as is to be attempted now, is necessary for the sake of winning symmetry, rhythm, and balance in our educational ideal. We cannot perfectly succeed. Each age, while striving for true proportion in one direction, sacrifices it in another. But every educational triumph is in fact a triumph of balance, achieved not by taking off weights from one side but by adding them to the other. And the backward look, focused naturally on these triumphs of past ages, helps us to detect want of balance in our own. At least it must help to safeguard the prime conditions of balance, which escape us often by their very simplicity—the dual basis of education for mind and body; the dual nature of mind, as intelligence, and as will or desire; the inclusion, therefore, within the single educational aim, of a triple aim—health, wisdom and goodness. The backward look will quickly remind us that the prize-fighter, the book-worm, and the anchorite are all educational failures (though not, as we shall see, in equal degree), because for the sake of one element in the Humanist ideal they sacrificed the other two. Lopsidedness is sin.

This demand for balance and comprehensiveness, expressing itself again and again in the triple formula, is the simplest and most conspicuous thing in the Humanist tradition. By itself it suggests the risk of a sectional education, such as we are tolerating to-day, and a Faculty Psychology. But genuine Humanism knows nothing of these dis-

tortions. Its ideal is triple, but its deepest principle is the principle of life-unity. Health, wisdom and goodness are the threefold activity of a single life, and the educational ideal is simply the life-ideal. Definition of either is impossible, but the terms which best describe life—such terms as freedom, individuality, self-activity, adaptability, interest, rhythm¹—are also the best descriptions of education. The controlling power of each must be the self-directing effort of interest; the denial and the death of each is that mechanical conformity which is “the obedience of a corpse.”

Nevertheless, the free spirit of life and of education must seek material for its activity outside itself. As life is the interplay of inner and outer, so education requires the response of the objective world. Environment conditions growth. Impression and absorption are the needful complement of expression. Creative activity cannot operate in a vacuum, and may operate amiss if the material be hostile. The interplay of inner and outer is life; its guidance is education, which thus is charged, in the interests of individuality, with care for the environment. These things, a comprehensive and well-balanced educational aim, a self-active development, and a good environment are conveyed by the first range

¹ The inner community of these ideas is brought to light by their common enemy, mechanism. The last term, rhythm, expresses the living *order* of co-operative activity, which in education is to replace the dead order of uniformity. Both orders involve *repetition*, but the one is the repetition of design, the other of dullness, ignorance, or want of design. The one is used by the artist, the other by the machine. For the metaphysical basis of the theory, see Bosanquet, *The Principle of Individuality and Value*, Chap III. For a like basis for the doctrine of *Interest*, see Nettleship, *Philosophical Lectures and Remains*.

of Humanist principles. They themselves require a further advance.

"In the interests of individuality." The Humanists were called each one to interpret this enigma—Individuality—with which we are still battling. Our latest thought¹ brings us very close, once more, to Plato and Aristotle, in spite of cross-currents. Soon we shall reassert clearly what they of all Humanists said most clearly, that individuality is social, and that education, in seeking the highest good of the individual, does so in the interests of the community, and by means of social service. If they themselves and their successors—especially in Southern Europe—through many centuries stopped short of the full conclusion—a democratic state and universal education—it is still emphatically true that Humanism knows nothing of an isolated self-culture towards which the social order is regarded simply as a means. There is no self-realisation, for Humanism, save in social activity. Therefore the second range of Humanist principles is concerned with civic and social education. The ideal for the individual is the ideal for the State. In the interests of both the direct aim of education is the making of good citizens. And the most perfectly educated must render the fullest social service—that is, must be the controlling power in political government, whether directly or indirectly. Further, educated citizens being the best asset of the State, and complete education the only reasonable ideal for the

¹ *e. g.* Bosanquet—*Gifford Lectures of 1911, 1912, The Principle of Individuality and Value, and The Value and Destiny of the Individual*. The description of Bergsonian and Pragmatist Philosophy as "cross-currents" is only partly true, but true in this connection.

individual, it follows that all should be educated to the full extent of their capacity. Here the differences among Humanists arise from their different levels of faith in human nature. Who, and how many, are capable of being educated? They are agreed that all such must at least have opportunity.

These are the central thoughts of Humanists concerning the true character and purpose of education. And on these broad uplands, and in the serene atmosphere of generalisation, they seem beyond the range of criticism. But in regard to method and the actual resources of the teacher the attacks have been numerous and fierce, and never so numerous and fierce as to-day, when once more Humanists are speaking audibly and in earnest. It is true that the Humanist tradition, with few exceptions, lays little stress on method; possibly, too little, though we are inclined to regard this comparative neglect as a clear application of "first things first." It is true that not one of their number will furnish a solution to what is insoluble—the daily problem of an ill-equipped teacher entrusted with the entire education of sixty children according to the Code. But it is also true that the chief Humanist principles remaining for our notice are precisely designed to secure the practical conditions of success in education, and to rule out absolutely the possibility of such conditions as those which still create the insoluble problems of practice. The conditions insisted on are three: First, discipline must be gentle, relying on interest and consistently rejecting the motive of fear. Secondly, teaching must be individual and by competent teachers, for large classes and unskilled teachers must reduce it

to educational futility, whatever triumphs of mechanism or of despotism may be achieved by them. And thirdly, education must be prolonged up to manhood and womanhood if it is to achieve its end for the individual and the State. It is impossible to overstate the emphasis and the unanimity with which these three conditions are laid down. When we have ceased to defy them, questions of method may assume less alarming proportions and meet with more satisfactory answers.

It would seem, then, that Humanist education rests on nine chief articles of faith, three stating the general conception of the ideal for the individual, three dealing with its political and social character, three laying down practical conditions of its realisation. These shall now be condensed into the briefest possible creed.

- I. (a) The ideal is one, yet triple—the development of the unified “good life,” physical, mental and moral.
 - (b) The process of development is free activity. It is an interest not a necessity, and its purpose is not a livelihood, but life.
 - (c) The ideal includes right environment, made effective by assimilation and absorption.
- II. (a) The ideal is social. For (i) self-realisation is only possible in a community, and through social service. And (ii) the welfare of the community depends on the individual education of its members.

- (b) Therefore the rulers of the State must be, directly or indirectly, its most educated men. And the State must make education its first concern.
- (c) Therefore also education must be extended to every individual and every class that can profit by it.

- III. (a) Discipline must be gentle.
Coercion and punishment are educational failure.
- (b) Teaching must be individual, and entrusted only to competent teachers.
 - (c) Education must be prolonged into manhood and womanhood.

Thus crystallised into a creed, the consensus appears a strange mixture of paradox and commonplace. Some will condemn it on both grounds as unprofitable. No one at this time of day is going to question the triple ideal, so wearisomely repeated; but perhaps no one is going to uphold the universally extended education which alone makes the ideal realisable. Again, no one at this time of day is going to deny the importance of environment; but perhaps no one is going to advocate any really efficient measures for the removal of slums. Apparently, where the Humanists generalise they meet with universal acclaim; where they require consistent application of their theory they meet with cynical or kindly indifference. But they were not concerned with mere theorising. They were vehemently in earnest. Nor did they ever hold out promises that right education was a thing easy to

establish. They only asserted that it was necessary for human well-being, and therefore worth any price whatever.

If the spirit of their teaching could survive such drastic compression as we have attempted, it might well be the constant innermost possession of every teacher, the very essence of his educational law, enshrined in that brief creed and, without need of a phylactery, carried about with him as the Jew carried his religious law, that he might never be parted from its spirit. But it is probable that such a condensed summary will be of most use to those who can read the interpreting Humanist literature most widely. To them the summarising words may recall the spirit, and be indeed as words have often been, a sacrament. For others, they must be relatively barren and unprofitable. But at least the "Creed" may be a guide to the following chapters, explaining the emphasis and recurrence of just those principles which it has tried to embody.

Our next obligation is to justify each of these abstract statements of principle by a direct reference to the Humanists themselves.

It has been said that the Humanist tradition is one and unbroken. Nevertheless among Humanists there are sometimes differences of emphasis, omissions, and varied applications. The most complete expression of their common faith is found in Plato and Aristotle, who are even at this day our best correctives against exaggeration or defect. Therefore, in seeking now to present the nine principles in less abstract form, clothed with the teaching of men, we shall consistently give precedence to Plato's exposition, and, among other Humanists

take such brief notice as is possible of the most valuable contributions or the most significant variations. It will be understood that we are very far from attempting the impossible—a survey, in a few pages, of the history of Humanist education. The purpose is rather to set up signposts by which the Humanist territory, in any age and any land, may be quickly recognised.

Even so, the discussion will carry this chapter beyond its due limits. We would suggest to the reader that he may regard this second and longest portion as an appendix, if he will, which may without detriment to the argument be postponed till the conclusion of the book, or read in connection with the various chapters as they deal with the principles in question. On the other hand, it is on this direct authority—the authority of the Humanists themselves in their unshaken unanimity—that every one of the later chapters relies. This “Appendix,” therefore, may serve as a summary of the whole argument, as well as its justification.

I. (a) THE PRINCIPLE OF COMPREHENSIVENESS AND
BALANCE

As expressed in the triple aim it is quite clear that this is not, in the thought of Plato and Aristotle, the principle of equality, but of rational subordination of the lesser to the greater gain. The physical ideal—need one say it of the Greek?—is not slighted, but the intellectual and moral ideal is tremendously predominant. Plato, assigning the priceless years of early manhood to an undiluted course of physical training, is careful to explain that he does so “for the soul’s sake” and not the body’s. “You suppose,” he says, “like everybody else, that gymnastics are for the good of the body. They are not. They are, like music, for the soul.” Their use is to develop moral powers of hardihood and temperance.”¹ On the other hand, the ideal of harmony rules out all ill-usage or neglect of the body, and all sordidness or distortion in the material environment. It rules out asceticism as an end in itself; it accepts it as a means to better harmony. Erasmus, with his “books before clothes” was a true Humanist in his personal conflict with poverty; but in his slighting of the physical aim in education as not in itself a worthy end, he was less Humanist than was Rabelais. And though in the main Humanist tradition the principle of balance is never abrogated, it is clear that the chief risk has been on this side, of neglect of the physical basis of life, and that in the actual anti-Humanist practice of the schools up to our own century this violation of the

¹ *Republic*, Book VII. Jowett’s translation.

principle of balance has been wild and flagrant. Apart from sheer physical cruelty and physical neglect, the unmitigated vigour of mental discipline which monopolised the life of a scholar in the grammar schools of older days was the grimmest satire conceivable on their professed allegiance to the Classics.¹ But the reports of the first medical inspections of school children are perhaps as great a reproach to nineteenth-century educators as the actual barbarities of pedagogues were to their predecessors. The twentieth century is at least helping to restore the true Humanist balance in this respect.

The triple ideal has suffered twofold violence, by this neglect of the first element, and also by the perverted supremacy awarded to the second, often in its narrowest significance as the acquisition of information. "Let me see thee," says Rabelais, here falling a victim to the evil he sets out to combat, "an abyss and bottomless pit of knowledge." But in the Humanist tradition, which does not thus contract the definition of mind, how radiantly clear is the exaltation of the mental and moral aims, and how deep and dark is the mystery of their unity and their difference! To which realm, the intellectual or the moral, does Plato's Idea of the Good belong? It is the goal of perfected morality, and it is pure thought. Again, all the practical goodness of Aristotle's citizen is included under one "intellectual virtue," a "Practical Wisdom," and this surrenders itself at last to the higher ideal of Contemplation, which is the life of God. The more we can identify wisdom and goodness, the knowledge

¹ See, for instance, the record of a Westminster Scholar quoted in full by Monroe, *History of Education*, p. 525.

of what is with the love of what is right, the more are we in touch with our Masters. It is only the false narrowing of the intellectual aim to mere information that could warrant any hard and fast demarcation of it from the moral. Judgments of value are judgments of fact, and, for the Humanist, these facts are of the highest order, taking precedence of scientific facts just so far as these are made to exclude value. Accordingly we find that Humanist educators do consistently set the moral aim above the intellectual, or else refuse to distinguish them. Comenius, who most exalts "Pansophy," is assuredly convinced, with Socrates, that virtue is knowledge. His own definition of the educational ideal is "se (et secum omnia) nosse, regere, ad Deum dirigere."¹ Herbart most nearly approaches him in this exaltation of knowledge for the sake of goodness. "The stupid man cannot be virtuous." Others lay less stress on the means, and are even, comparatively, careless of information. "The one and the whole work of education," says Pestalozzi, "may be summed up in the concept, morality." And this is the spirit of Arnold and of Thring, whose was "the ever-present conviction that the business of a school is to train up men for the service of God," and to whom "in a peculiarly vivid way life presented itself as a battlefield between good and evil."² Most interesting is Luther's position, who puts the religious and moral purpose first, but asserts more forcibly than any one the supreme value of education for the whole of life, "were there neither

¹ "Self-knowledge, and knowledge of the universe withal self-government, and a Godward course"

² Parkin, *Life and Letters of Edward Thring*, pp. 227, 282.

soul, heaven nor hell." A few years later Ascham, the typical English Humanist of the earlier School, sets down in order the schoolmaster's objects: "God's fear," "honesty of life," "perfectness of learning,"¹ and adds the requirement of gymnastics for all, and of much recreation for the "best wits," though he thinks that "base and dumpish wits can never be hurt by continual study."² We are brought back to our first and foremost principle of balance, and it is needless to multiply the quotations of Humanists. Professor Laurie's summarising words are our best conclusion: "If the intellectual aim is always the same with the best writers, so even still more are they at one on the supreme importance of the moral aim and the value of gymnastic."³

I. (b) THE PRINCIPLE OF LIFE-UNITY AND FREEDOM

With one consent, though with a thousand different modes of expression the Humanists ask for life and for reality. With one consent they re-echo Plato's judgment: "No learning ought to be learnt with bondage." With one consent they denounce what in almost every age, including our own, has been the prevailing mode of instruction, viz. the mechanical imparting of facts. The tragedy of education has been the prolonged failure of Humanism to secure conditions under which its purpose might be realised for the people at large.

¹ *The Scholemaster.*

² *Toxophilus.*

³ *Educational Opinion from the Renaissance.*

It has been all along a choice of evils—the inhumanist exclusion of the great majority, or the surrender of the central characteristics of Humanism to the exigencies of large classes. Was Bell's monitorial system which, in the nineteenth century, as a newly-discovered time-saving machine, turned out a whole population of readers in place of a few favoured book-lovers—was it an educational triumph or tragedy? In spite of his democratic zeal we find it impossible to class Bell among the Humanists, while we are fain to admit many who, like Elyot and Ascham, perhaps never contemplated the wholesale extension of their free and gracious educational methods. It will be observed that this second principle has immediately embraced two at least of the last group, the demand for individual teaching and for gentle discipline. For, whatever the term chosen to express the life-unity, its characteristic is free growth from within, and such growth is an individual thing, and prohibits wholesale methods. Equally, and absolutely, does it prohibit methods of compulsion and the discipline of fear.

Very various are the applications of the second principle by Humanists; Rabelais, Montaigne and Rousseau laying low by their destructive criticism the fatuities of the Gargantuan code and asking, each in his own way, for realism; Comenius, Pestalozzi and Fröbel applying to child-study the results of a devoted nature-study; Herbart demanding interest as the condition of moral goodness and of intellectual gain; Madame Montessori identifying activity with freedom, and both with goodness; a great and increasing company of moderns—with

true Humanist adaptation—finding satisfaction for the principle in manual work of every kind, in agriculture, gardening, or domestic work. These later applications have been an ancient occasion of stumbling, and Richard Mulcaster, for instance, though included in the Humanist fellowship on other accounts, and for various practical developments of Humanism, wellnigh forfeits his claim for such a statement as this: "If the man delves the earth, and the matter dwells in heaven, there is no means of uniting them over so great a distance." We may like the frankness of the opinion, but we do not like the opinion. We hold it the acme of treason both to Humanism and Christianity—to those two fellowships separated from each other now by the thinnest of veils, perhaps only by a name, which stand for the sacredness of "common" life—the fellowship of John Ball and Piers Plowman, of Pestalozzi, Fröbel and Grundtvig, and of the author of that saying among the Logia, "Raise the stone and there thou shalt find me; cleave the wood and there am I."

It is only in regard to the subjects of instruction that Mulcaster is at variance with the principle of life-unity and gravely in arrears of Rabelais, who, half a century before, had appealed for first-hand intercourse with nature. In regard to teaching-method, he accepts it, and we may cancel the black error of the former quotation by another from his own writings: "The end of education and training is to help nature to her perfection in the complete development of all the various powers." Here he is equally in accord with the Greek founders of Humanism and with his successors—with Pesta-

lozzi, in his desire "to psychologise education," with Herbart, in his faith that "a many-sided interest is hostile to vice," and with Frobel, whose thoughtful description of the principle seems to include all those aspects of it which we have tried to suggest—individuality, activity, adaptability, interest, rhythm and freedom.

"Therefore, that which is to have true, abiding and blessing, instructive and formative effect on the child as pupil and scholar, and as a future man, viz. independent employment—must not only be founded on life as it actually appears, must not only be connected with life, but must also form itself in harmony with the requirements of life, of the surroundings, and of the time, and with what they offer. It must especially have an arousing and wakening effect on the inner life of the child and must thus spontaneously germinate from that life."¹

I. (c) THE PRINCIPLE OF GOOD ENVIRONMENT

Intensity of zeal for the second principle is perhaps responsible for comparative neglect, in some instances, of the third. It might also be urged that it is included by many Humanists in their treatment of the triple ideal, and that outer and inner need not thus be distinguished. But educational history witnesses very clearly to the need of such special and direct concern for environment as we find in certain Humanists. Vittorino is as scrupulous in his avoidance of luxurious conditions as in his tender care of a sick pupil. Elyot

¹ Frobel, *Education as Development*.

is peculiarly anxious about the moral environment of young children. The demand for large airy classrooms is a commonplace. Pestalozzi is the spiritual contemporary of Madame Montessori when he sums up the schoolmaster's work in the words: "He only takes care that no untoward influence shall disturb Nature's march of development." But the "only" may comprehend a vast positive activity, and the negative wording is far from implying *laissez-faire* in regard to environment. Most conspicuous in modern times was Thring's "audacity" of reforming zeal in regard to the school buildings at Uppingham, until the whole structural basis and physical environment were brought into conformity with the moral and intellectual ideal. "It is hard to escape something of the pig if lodged in a sty," he says. And "another grave cause of evil in schools is the dishonour shown to the place in which the work is done."¹ So great was Thring's belief in the "almighty wall," and its power for good or evil, that certain pages of his diary, if read without the context, might mark him as a materialist. If so, it is the materialism of Plato, and one which we need not fear. "Then will our youth dwell in a land of health and fair sights and sounds, and receive the good in everything; and beauty, the effluence of fair works, shall flow into the eye and ear, like a health-giving breeze from a purer region, and insensibly draw the soul from earliest years into likeness and sympathy with the beauty of reason."²

¹ Parkin, *Life and Letters of Edward Thring*, pp. 220, 223.

² *Republic*, III, 401, Jowett's translation.

II. THE SOCIAL IDEAL. (a) EDUCATION FOR CITIZENSHIP

We come to the crucial test of Humanism—its conception of individuality as social, and of education as social progress. For earlier Humanists the full range of this principle was hardly conceivable, much less practicable. What can be asserted of them is that their own main theory or practice could consistently lead to no other conclusion than that of a universal education centred on social service. But upon Humanists in a democratic state to-day the full obligation of the principle must be a far more exacting, because a far more practicable thing.

For Plato and Aristotle the life of active citizenship and public service was the only possible life for the educated. It might be regarded as the supreme privilege, or as the supreme sacrifice—the descent of philosophy to the cave.¹ In any case, it is the supreme necessity of “nature,” which, for Plato, demands that philosophy shall rule the man, and philosophers the State, and, for Aristotle, requires that man shall live in civic relationships. Both knew, with intense conviction, that self-realisation is social service. Like a faint echo of their voices is Quintilian’s account of the educated citizen, who combines vast knowledge with moral goodness, and on these grounds is marked out for holding high office in the State. Vittorino’s educational aim is expressed by his biographer in the words of the old Bidding Prayer—the supply of fit

¹ *Republic*, VII, *init.*

persons "duly qualified to serve God in church and state."¹ But of later Humanists, waging their endless warfare on mechanism, some who took unto themselves the whole external armour of individuality lost sight of its inmost paradoxical essence, its social nature. In the perverted cult of freedom, self-activity and interest, social obligation came to be ignored, as by Rousseau, and, less flagrantly, by Montaigne. There were others, such as Erasmus, Comenius, or Pestalozzi, for whom national and political catastrophes, or their own circumstances, rendered civic education a peculiarly difficult matter, either to practice or to preach. Yet Erasmus, the "world-citizen," includes *vitæ officia* among the four objects of education; Comenius sets his pastoral care for his scattered and persecuted Moravians above the claims of patron or of educational treatise; Pestalozzi proved his patriotism by his life, as well as by his educational system, on which Fichte expressly placed his hopes of a national resurrection. Fichte, arousing Germany from the death-sleep of 1807 by the new cry of nationality, gave no hope of its realisation, save through national education; and the German nation obeyed the double challenge. Denmark, soon after, was answering with yet more wonderful vigour the call of Bishop Grundtvig, and through the People's High Schools the nation was renewed. We have nothing in our annals, even of the fourteenth century, to compare with these deeds of heroism in education. Nor, in our puny and isolated efforts to-day to give a civic character to education, have we anything to compare with American progress

¹ Woodward, *Vittorino da Feltre*.

in this direction, or with the work of Professor Dewey. Yet it was an English Humanist, Milton, who best of all expresses the civic and social ideal: "I call a compleat and generous education that which fits a man to perform justly, skilfully and magnanimously all the offices, both private and public, of Peace and War."

II. (b) EDUCATION FOR GOVERNMENT

The whole argument for this principle has been traversed in discussing education for citizenship. Government being a specialised, not necessarily a higher form of citizenship, education stands in the same relation to both, as the indispensable condition. And government, like citizenship, is the "natural" work of the educated—both in its widest sense, as the control of public policy by educated public opinion, and in its specialised sense, as the skilled administration of the various Departments by experts whose education has been designed for this end. We may note here an interesting difference in the application of the same principle by Plato and by Comte. Belief that education is the sole salvation of the State leads Plato to require of his "guardians," the philosophers, the surrender of their own best years (from thirty-five to fifty) and their own best interest (philosophy) to the work of government. Having won through pain and conflict the high mountain-tops of wisdom for the world's sake, for the world's sake they must now come down, surrendering the fruits of enjoyment. Comte, on the other hand, forbids the sacrifice, and though all the principles of government are to be

dictated by the perfected sociologists, they are to delegate to lesser men the practical task of governing, that knowledge be not hindered.

II. (c) THE DEMOCRATIC EXTENSION OF EDUCATION

How long are the perfected philosophers and sociologists to confront an ignorant and recalcitrant world? Faith in democracy rests on faith in human nature as such, and its capacity for freedom. That faith neither Plato nor Aristotle could, in their generation, clearly affirm; Aristotle expressly denies it, saying in effect there are men who are not men. But what in our days can justify this grand inconsistency? If the Humanist conception of social individuality be true, our educational journey can lead us no whither short of universal education, and our political progress can be only towards democracy. As to the former, we may be indifferent. Frederick the Great may call himself "the chief servant of the state," and Kant, his subject, was certainly a king, ruling from Königsberg a dominion wider and more permanent than Frederick's. But in fact and in reality, Humanism, which counts education the chief good of the individual and the sole salvation of the State, must press on, through universal education, towards an enlightened democracy.

For long centuries the aristocratic ideal was too strong in politics and in society for Humanism to establish its rival in education, and Humanism was slower than the Churches to recognise its obligation. The efforts of the Brothers of the Common Life and the Jansenists, of Luther, La Salle, and

Mulcaster¹ are brave but isolated. Comenius, helped perhaps by the shattering of his national ideal to reach a higher one, stands gloriously apart as the first to demand "all knowledge for all men." Pestalozzi and Fröbel renewed the second part of the tremendous claim. "Education must be simple, and it must be for all." And, comparing the work of these three with that of Madame Montessori and the recent spread of free kindergartens, we may note that special care for infant education is often thus coupled with the demand for universal education. Child-study seems the training school of democracy. Two significant facts bear out this conclusion—the suppression of kindergartens in Prussia even before the death of Fröbel, under suspicion of their revolutionary character; and the advanced efficiency of infant education in the United States to-day.

English progress is very slow, and the cause is surely that we have not really and deeply learnt the Humanist principle of social individuality. Still we oppose the good of the individual to the good of the State. Still we are blind to their identity, so that a recent review of several new educational books ranges them in two camps, *either* that of Professor Dewey *or* that of Mr. Holmes and Madame Montessori. It is no new trouble. We have seen that in Rousseau the emphasis on individual "free" development is so strong as to make his educational theory anti-social, and a powerful contribution to the destructive forces

¹ It is to Mulcaster's great credit that he asks for higher skill and a higher salary in the case of Elementary Teachers than in any other department of teaching.

which culminated in the French Revolution. And some may see in the work of Otto Berthold and Ellen Key,¹ and even in the Montessori principles, a repetition of this tendency to-day. On the other hand, Professor Dewey is setting his counter-emphasis on the civic aspect of education. A superficial criticism, noting these two fresh orientations of our century, might say that the robe of Humanism was surely rent in twain, and that we must choose between these arch-foes of individualism and socialism in education. How can Emile and the Montessori school be brought into line with the civic teaching either of Professor Dewey or of Plato, based as his was on the magnificent self-effacement of Socrates? Must we, indeed, as Rousseau bade us, "choose between making a man and a citizen, for we cannot make them both at once"? Or can Humanism reconcile the two ideals?

It can, and it must. Nor is the reconciliation any new thing. Plato and Aristotle perfectly expounded it, teaching that there is no individual perfection save in and through the State, and no perfecting of the State except through the freedom of those individuals who by education were made capable of it. Self-realisation and social service are synonymous. Therefore both the "new orientations" are true, bringing us back and bringing us forward to a genuine Humanism. And their difference is indeed only a difference of emphasis. That emphasis Madame Montessori, working first for very young children, rightly set on the individualist side. But this is method and not principle.

¹ Ellen Key, *The Century of the Child*.

The principle, so far from committing itself to the Rousseau fallacy, is expressly stated as the replacing of competition by co-operation. And, if the work of the babes must be chiefly individual, their play and their general ordering of affairs is by common consent markedly co-operative and social.

This answer to criticism seemed necessary because the place of the Montessori system in the Humanist tradition must depend on it. Rousseau's extreme individualism was needed as a reaction, but his place among Humanists is held in spite of it, not because of it. Our own day needs no such reaction. It needs nothing less than the reassertion of the Greek Humanists' ideal—self-realisation through society—a reassertion made for us convincingly by the philosophy of Thomas Hill Green. In the light of this teaching, given afresh to our own age, education must demand the full measure of truth which both Madame Montessori and Professor Dewey can contribute. Their ideals are necessary to each other, and here not selection, but comprehension is our task.

We end as we began, with the demand for an individuality that is social. Whether we travel by the light of logical consistency, or by the light of practical experience of a wrongful social order, or by the light of mystic insight, such as Fröbel's, into the unity of nature, we can reach no other goal than this. If our second principle is true, if education is natural, then it must be universal.

III. PRACTICAL CONDITIONS. (a) GENTLE DISCIPLINE

To Humanists this is not a matter open to dispute, unless their whole theory, philosophical, social, and practical, is to be undermined. The alternative to gentle discipline is coercion, which is extraneous, an alien force capable of producing only a mechanical response, and fatal therefore to the second principle of Humanism, to self-activity, free growth, and interest. The Humanist position here is so simple and so incontestable that it ought not to need discussing, were it not for the astonishing and frightful record of educational practice. Against that practice, Vittorino, Erasmus, Elyot, Ascham, Comenius, Pestalozzi, Fröbel, and Herbart—to name only some of the outstanding—laboured and wrote; and nothing can be added to the grave reasonableness, the skill, and the power of their argument. Their purpose is not yet accomplished. Even Mulcaster and Locke, who surrender the outworks of Humanism by false concessions and inconsistencies, are far ahead of the actual practice in countless schools to-day. But these two are on the outer fringe of Humanism. The Humanist tradition as a whole is unbroken in its acceptance of Plato's verdict that "no learning ought to be learnt with bondage." And in regard to moral faults, themselves a grave form of ignorance, Plato's principle finds its best and latest vindication in the Montessori school, where "discipline" is indeed enlightenment, and wrongdoing, that is, anti-social conduct, finds its "natural"

check in the isolation and loss of social privilege which result. The whole problem will confront us in a later chapter.¹ Here we need only stay to emphasise two things, the unanimity and the intensity of Humanist teaching on this subject, and the backwardness of educational practice, qualifying this last by the recognition of comparatively rapid improvement in very recent times.

III. (b) INDIVIDUAL TEACHING BY EFFICIENT TEACHERS

But why the "astonishing and frightful record"? Mainly because the second practical condition was not (perhaps could not be) fulfilled; because the problem of combining gentle discipline with wholesale teaching was, except for the genius, insoluble. The earliest Humanists assumed small numbers, and close personal intercourse between Teacher and Taught. Then, for long ages, the form of individual teaching was retained, even in a crowded schoolroom. Early illustrations of school life make the situation painfully clear to us—a crowd of boys, a single master, one boy being taught, and a birch at hand. The "method" was terrorism, and the method survives because, though class-teaching superseded the vain attempt at individual teaching, class-teaching, unsupplemented, is not a true educational method, and where the numbers are great, is fatal to the second Humanist principle.

As for the Humanists, while the aristocratic ideal constrained them, it saved them at least from the

¹ Chap. VII.

acuteness of our own problem. But they have not left us in any doubt as to their judgment. It is the tutorial system and abundant individual care that Rabelais, Locke and Montaigne require. Erasmus asks for small groups of scholars, taught by highly skilled tutors.¹ Comte will have fourteen years of private education by the mother. And the modern Humanists who accept or approve class-teaching are equally sure that the individual must not suffer loss. Thring's desired class-limit of twenty to twenty-five would find a very large number of advocates to-day; but we have still to win a hearing for Mulcaster's most just contention that the need for the most skilled work, and the most individual work, is in the Elementary Schools.

As for the competence of the teacher, the older Humanists took this also too much for granted to discuss it at great length, or frequently. But Elyot in *The Boke named the Governour*, Ascham in *The Scholemaster*, and Fuller in the Schoolmaster sketch contained in the *Book of Worthies*, have given us the older Humanist standard, and it is not a low one. Mulcaster and Comenius faced the need of definite training, long before public opinion would countenance it. Ours is the generation which, having won external facilities of training, is charged with the greater task of imparting to that training the stamp of Humanism. Is the statement too obvious, or is it too daringly novel, that the institution on which more than any other the well-being of the nation—its health, its wisdom, its goodness and its happiness—depend, is the Elementary Training College?

¹ *Op.* V, 716^A

III. (c) EXTENDED EDUCATION

At what age may the Humanist purpose, a social individuality, be attained? This, and no other, must be the "leaving age"; and we are not surprised to find that the Humanists for the most part either leave it undecided or suggest a fairly advanced age. Plato proposes thirty years, twenty-five, or twenty according to the capacity of the individual for profiting by very advanced study. But twenty would be the earliest age sanctioned. Comte ordains twenty-one years for every one alike. In Grundtvig's High Schools the age is commonly about twenty-five. And we in England in our day have scarcely got beyond the scheme of Comenius, which nearly three hundred years ago provided universal education in the vernacular schools till the age of twelve, and an extended education, for those who could obtain it, till adult life. But we stand on the brink of better things. And we know now that the Humanist ideal cannot be realised by any educational system that stops short of adolescence. Are we ready also to admit Dr. Kerschensteiner's most reasonable contention, that extended education, through Continuation School and University, is a far more urgent necessity for the children of the poor than for those whose homes and social environment are, or at least should be, some guarantee in themselves of culture and liberal interests?

We have tried to understand the Humanist tradition. We have found great central themes on

which they speak with one voice. We have found certain lapses and inconsistencies of individuals. And we have found certain strong tendencies which still await their fulfilment.

Two questions remain—great questions, but needing only brief answers now, since our whole discussion has in fact been concerned with them, and those who have not already assented to the conclusions implied throughout are little likely to be convinced by a formal statement.

First, what is the place of religion in the Humanist scheme? The old antagonism of Humanism and Christianity in Southern Europe was due to the immaturity of both. Any surviving antagonism to-day is due to the same cause and to no other. But the reconciliation was achieved and demonstrated by Vittorino, "the first modern schoolmaster," and it is in the words of his biographer¹ that a formal answer to the question can best be given. "The dignity of human life was by him based upon its relation to the divine." Theology can help but little—and how often has it hindered!—by attempting to define this relation. Humanism is concerned not with the definition but with the fact—not with the addition of a tenth principle to safeguard religious dogma, but with the living diffusion of religion through each of the nine. We have read the Humanists to little purpose if we have not realised that for them the truth for which the Incarnation stands is the foundation of faith.

And the second question is: What must be our own contribution in this age to the Humanist

¹ Woodward.

tradition? And, just because of our Christian and Humanist faith in the divinity of human life, for us there can be but one answer, grave and simple, to the question of our own contribution to the Humanist tradition. It is its universal extension, in all its comprehensiveness of aim, though not in lifeless uniformity of detail. There may be types of school innumerable, but there must be nowhere any wholesale omissions or perversion of emphasis or flagrant misapplications. These things, to our shame, still abound. We have accepted the triple, yet unified ideal, its freedom, its life, its activity; the conditions of its fulfilment, in right environment and right interest; its social character. And we now claim, not its universal enforcement, but universal opportunity of its realisation. Only by making this contribution can we find a place among Humanists.

And, if we hardly dare to assert our membership in that company, still less may we dare to be excluded.

FOR REFERENCE

PLATO. *Republic*.

ARISTOTLE. *Politics*.

” *Ethics*.

NETTLESHIP. *Lectures on the Republic of Plato*. Macmillan.

LAURIE. *Educational Opinion from the Renaissance*. Cambridge University Press.

LAURIE. *Comenius*. Cambridge University Press.

MONROE. *History of Education* (Handbook). Macmillan.

” ” ” ” (Sources).

PAINTER. *Great Pedagogical Essays*. American Book Co.

QUICK. *Educational Reformers*. Longmans.

- FITCH. *Lectures on Teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
Macmillan.
- ADAMS. *Evolution of Educational Theory*.
- BRERETON. *Studies in Foreign Education*. Harrap.
- BOYD. *From Locke to Montessori*.
- WOODWARD. *Vittorino da Feltre*. Cambridge University Press.
" *Erasmus Concerning Education*. Cambridge
University Press.
- OLIPHANT. *Richard Mulcaster (Educational Aims and Writ-
ings of)*. Maclehose.
- ELYOT. *The Boke Named the Governour*.
- ASCHAM. *The Scholemaster*. Constable.
- COMENIUS. *The Great Didactic*. Black.
- MILTON. *Tractate on Education*. Cambridge University Press.
- LOCKE. *Some Thoughts Concerning Education*. Cambridge
University Press.
- ROUSSEAU. *Emile*. Dent.
- COMTE. *Principles of Positivist Philosophy*.
- STANLEY. *Life of Arnold*. Murray.
- PARKIN. *Life and Letters of Thring*. Macmillan.
- MONTESORI. *The Montessori Method*. Heinemann.
- DEWEY. *The School and the Child*. Blackie.

CHAPTER III

ADAPTABILITY AND FREEDOM

ADAPTABILITY THE CENTRAL PRINCIPLE OF HUMANIST EDUCATION.

Also the Heart of the Conflict between Educational and Industrial Ideals.

Self-activity and Growth *versus* Mechanism and Repetition.

THE INDUSTRIAL OBJECTION—

Drudgery has got to be done.

The Answer (to be expanded in Chapter IX): *Even for Industrial and Commercial Ends* Adaptability, and therefore a Non-mechanical Education, is necessary.

ADAPTABILITY IN THE SCHOOL—

The means of promoting it: (a) Self-government in School and Playground; (b) Self-teaching.

The present level of Adaptability.

CHAPTER III

ADAPTABILITY AND FREEDOM

"Above all things, avoid the slough of routine, the decline and fall into methods of mere drill. It is by constant creation you will succeed."—SIR PHILIP MAGNUS, *Presidential Address to National Association of Manual Training Teachers*. 1894.

"The School has only one great end, to make itself unnecessary, to allow life and fortune, which is another way of saying self-activity, to take the place of system and method."—ELLEN KEY, *The Century of the Child*. 1913.

"The more the girls are like machines, the better they please me. I don't want them to think. If they do they'll pinch their fingers."—*Statement of English Factory-owner*. 1913.

BETWEEN the first two of these utterances and the third, what hope of reconciliation? Here is in very reality that clash of educational and industrial ideals of which we have spoken.¹ Yet we placidly transfer the child from school to factory. Which scheme of things is right? or are both at fault?

The second quotation claims, on the face of it, to be, like the first, the full expression of the Humanist ideal of self-activity, freedom, nature, life. But it errs, as destructive criticism is ever wont to err, by rejecting what is in fact essential to its own principle. Life is not the denial of system and method; it is the perfection of them. "System" is the property not of a machine, nor of a corpse, but of a living thing. "Method" is,

¹ Chap. I, pp. 10, 11.

etymologically, a journeying and a quest—a journey not at random, but with a purpose, which guides it and so prevents waste and needless error. It is an unworthy conception of “nature” which represents her as the supreme anarchist. Rather, she is for ever approaching, in her age-long process, the perfect law of liberty, from which anarchy and tyranny are equally estranged.

We have not, then, to choose between life and system, between self-activity and method. We have to include them all, pronouncing that a lawless life is a contradiction in terms, and a dead method no method. As educators, we shall seek originality, freedom, self-activity, as the true test and expression of method and system, not as alternatives to these. And we shall confront the author of the third quotation not with the too anarchic sentiments of Ellen Key, but with the weightier force of Humanist opinion which is every day finding fuller expression in such utterances as that of Sir Philip Magnus.

On the other hand, the employer who mistakes his human material for machinery, who “doesn’t want his girls to think,” is a bad economist, as well as an Inhumanist. He is wasting, and destroying through disuse, the very quality which gives the human material its superior value over machinery, viz. adaptability, which we here define as the ability and readiness to apply to a new process the skill acquired in the old, by virtue of an intelligent grasp of the connection and purpose of both. He is also largely responsible for the economic crises which arise whenever a section of these unadaptable human machines are, in the ordinary course of

"progress," ousted by some newer or better or cheaper machine of the non-human kind. Muscle alone cannot long compete against machinery.¹ Thus the economic position of the unadaptable press-worker or machine-feeder is wholly precarious. In times of cyclical depression these are the first to be paid off and the last to be reinstated, just because their contribution to industry has no distinctive quality of value, and is simply confined to quantity of output. For the same reason, these are the least able to find employment in other industries at such times of general depression, since in every one the same conditions obtain, and the unadaptable are everywhere the dispensable.

But it will readily be admitted that unadaptability is for the child not only proof of educational failure, but entails risk of economic failure afterwards. From the Employer's point of view, however, the difficulty of accepting the educational ideal of adaptability is so obvious, and his objection so inevitable, that it cannot be wholly reserved for the last chapter, to which it more properly belongs. How is the mass of unskilled work going to be done?

¹ Nor can brain-work of a low mechanical order. Compare the statement of a bank clerk: "There is an adding machine which can do my work, and do it better. My employer doesn't get it *because I am cheaper*." This man has now volunteered for active service.

THE DRUDGERY OF THE WORLD HAS GOT TO BE
DONE BY SOME ONE

The educational ideal of adaptability seems to the employer, and to a great body of "practical" people, to be the rejection of drudgery. And in the school-world itself there is no small protest, on this very ground, against those modern developments which stand conspicuously for self-activity, originality and resource—for natural growth as against conventional acquirement. It is felt that the spirit which is expressed in cardboard modelling, sand-trays, Morris dancing, dramatisation, and geography walks, is not the spirit which will get the drudgery of the world done. Half a century ago the same fear lurked at the root of the opposition to women's education. Just as then the vision of the unwomanly and wholly inefficient pedant rose up before the eyes of the timid and the scornful, so to-day does the vision arise of an educated democracy, a society the members whereof are one and all so "adaptable" to all the various businesses of life that they cannot in fact adapt themselves to a single one; so full of scheming and of the passion for original experiment that social convention and industrial machinery are together cast aside as things outworn; so busy with a new social order ever being fashioned in the cloudlands of the brain that at length the material basis of society slips from beneath their feet, and from the flights of free-thought the thinker drops heavily, not on to the solid comforts of an ordered food supply, an efficient, time-economising household, and a

smoothly running system of social intercourse, but down to wallowing depths of disorganisation and individualism. There, in those depths, self-deprived of all the economies and aids of industrial efficiency, the "adaptable" individual is apt to assume less noble proportions.

It is easy thus to caricature the visions of modern Humanists—of those who deliberately pronounce that industrial efficiency has been bought too dear, because the price has included the sacrifice of adaptability; because, when machinery came in, self-activity and adaptability went out; because Humanism and the Factory system, as it then appeared, could not co-exist. It is easy to relegate the "News from Nowhere" of William Morris, denouncing this very thing, to the Never Land of *Peter Pan*, the home of lost ideals as well as lost boys. But the case is not yet heard to the finish. Modern industrialism is not a fixed system, but a still fluid process—still so young that its own self-testing is but beginning, and its own first principles are still to be scrutinised. Its last reports on itself do in fact suggest not a little dissatisfaction with its own prevailing methods, on this very ground of unadaptability. They suggest a growing appreciation of the value—the economic value—of the human qualities as such, even apart from other valuations. And if this is already true of the upper ranks of industry, it is reasonable to look for a like development, though a less rapid one, in the lower.

The recognition of the commercial value of human adaptability as greater than that of mechanical dexterity and speed seems to be a necessary factor, along with other higher ones, in

all schemes of social and industrial reform. The educational reformer, while rejecting the motive, may welcome the fact. It is on this commercial ground first that Mr. Paton, Head Master of the Manchester Grammar School, rejects the narrower vocational Training which, in the name of Imperialism and the defence of British Industry, many would seek to impose upon our Elementary schools. "Clearly, the remedy for our backwardness" (in commerce) "and the hope of our future lie in the schools. And the first instinct of the person who calls himself a practical man is to say, 'We must have commercial subjects taught in our schools,' and the result is that the real human subjects of the curriculum are turned out in favour of shorthand, typewriting, and a style of book-keeping which bears no earthly relation to anything that ever comes within the boy's actual experience." This method, the writer contends, is the wrong method, if the aim be commercial success. In the case of Germany, "that success has been achieved by the abundant provision and efficiency of her higher education . . . It is the German Realschulen rather than her specialised commercial schools which have laid the foundation of Germany's commercial success."¹

Even from a commercial point of view, then, it can reasonably be insisted that the sacrifice of adaptability is suicidal. The so-called industrial efficiency which is supposed to demand the sacrifice will not remain efficient. But by raising a counter-objection we have not disposed of the still obdurate

¹ *Manchester Guardian*, January 27, 1914, "The English Schools and Commerce"—"An Education Problem."

fact that the *Drudgery must be done*. It requires fairer and closer handling.

We admit, with the Factory-owner, with the commercially-minded Imperialist, with the patient or impatient mother of a working-class home (to all of whom the curriculum of an ordinary Elementary School is wont to appear amazingly irrelevant), we admit that drudgery must be done, and that the school—be it Eton or the poorest Elementary School—which suppresses the will or the power to do it is at once unpractical and unpatriotic. We go further, and assert that, as a means to an end, drudgery is not an evil, but a purifying element in the life both of the individual and of society. And further still, as a means to an end drudgery is not incompatible with adaptability, but is its natural and inevitable ally.

But the whole strength of our contention lies in the condition laid down—*as a means to an end*—and the factory-owner and the teacher are equally bound by the condition. For the justification of machinery is simply that it releases human faculty for higher purposes, that by handing over a larger share of routine work to inanimate forces it economises time and brains and strength, and thereby renders possible a greater output of new creative work. Machinery should do for society what habit, rightly used, does for the individual. It would be well if we could recall William James from the dead to write a second and complementary chapter—a chapter on industrial process, to be for all employers what his chapter on “Habit”¹ is for teachers

¹ *Textbook of Psychology*, Chap. X. See also Chap. VII of this volume.

already, an indispensable classic—a warning and a hope, a persuasion and a light. If this true purpose of machinery and of habit be granted—the liberation of higher human faculty by economy in lower spheres—it must also be granted that where such liberation is more than cancelled by an increase of routine work caused by machinery, then machinery loses its ethical justification.

So in the school. Drudgery is a means to an end, and as such may be not only endured, but welcomed. But it is to be economised, to be helped in every possible way by the fuller understanding of the end as worthy, and by the training of that good servant and bad master, Habit. Every habit, every process of routine, may be tested by the degree in which it helps or hinders the free use of faculty. All those which prove helpful are good servants, but only one habit is a safe master—the master-Habit of Adaptability. Assuredly—

“A servant by this clause
Makes drudgery divine,”

but the sweeping of the room need be none the less divine because adaptability suggests a carpet-sweeper instead of a primitive broom. The true friend to human progress is not the indomitable housewife of toughest conservative fabric, whose code of dear honour is to retain to her dying day, in form and shape unchanged, the full sum of human drudgery wherewith her forbears of darker days were fain to cope, and to bequeath the same unto her heirs for ever. Rather, the recognition of the divine element in life, and the resultant faith in human progress, leads to the welcoming of every labour-saving appliance which adaptability can

bring forth—for the sake of worthier work and fuller life. There is no risk of slackness, no fear of energies rusting through disuse, so long as we “consider the end,” which is in truth not drudgery and not indolence, but life.

But when we bring back this question of drudgery and adaptability to the school, it will readily be admitted that, in the case of the average Elementary School, drudgery is in no danger of disappearing. It still looms large for most of the children, above the Infants’ School, and larger still for most of the teachers. It has its purifying influence, we cannot doubt, but its undue predominance is largely the explanation of that later acquiescence in the conditions of industrial work, where drudgery commonly ceases to be an element and becomes the whole.

Is that later acquiescence right? Do we seriously desire it? Is it the right and fitting outcome of our school discipline? How far is the school responsible for plain facts like these—that over fifty per cent. of our Elementary scholars go into unskilled work,¹ and more often from choice or

¹ Fifty-seven per cent. is the figure given by Mr. Cyril Jackson for boys leaving the London County Council Schools and going to unskilled trades in the year 1906–1907 (Report on Boy Labour, Cd. 4632). In a memorandum by a Head Master, included in Mr. Blair’s Report to the London County Council, 1908–1909, the percentage of boys going to *irregular* work is given as above forty. In many districts, and always for girls, the figure would be considerably higher. The distinction, however, of “skilled” and “unskilled” is increasingly hard to apply successfully. A triple classification seems needed, including a middle class of semi-skilled labour, such as that of a large proportion of machine-minders, repetition workers, warehouse-workers, and shop-assistants. For the purposes of this chapter, this large middle class would have to be reckoned with the lowest, on the ground

from indifference than from necessity; that the extra shilling at starting in an unskilled trade outweighs all considerations of dead monotony and utter poverty of outlook and resource and interest; that when the evil choice has been made, though discontent is common enough, discontent on the ground of monotony and drudgery is rare? The causes for which a job is thrown up are legion—low wages, change from piece-rate to time-rate, rough conditions generally, too much overtime, too much slack time, “words” with the foreman. Very seldom is the dulness and limitation of the work—the sheer drudgery of it—alleged as the reason, and very seldom is the choice of the next job made with any view of improvement in this respect. It may be that, though unrecognised by the worker, the real underlying cause of his vexation of spirit is drudgery. The fact remains that he does not recognise it, and does acquiesce in it. And once more we ask, is this acquiescence right or wrong? And is the school responsible for it?

The answer of Humanism is no uncertain one. It is not right, since, though drudgery is a lawful element in every life, it may have the monopoly of none. And the school is responsible just so far as it has failed to teach adaptability, failed to reveal the *ends* for which drudgery exists, and failed to win appreciation of the worth of that life towards which drudgery is a means.

Therefore, we in the schools must preach and must practise the right proportion of drudgery,

that it does not promote adaptability. In that case the percentage of boys and girls whose occupation fails to satisfy the requirement would be something like seventy.

regarding it for ourselves, and letting the children regard it, always as a means to something better and more joyous than itself. But the joyous end, once recognised, has a way of infecting the means also. Drudgery has a curious tendency to vanish as soon as it is labelled "means only." We need not be afraid. There will always be something fresh to wear the label. We can safely and thankfully leave the drudgery-element to find its own material for many a generation—in fact till we are within sight of William Morris' Utopia, where the worst dread of the folk is that the work—which is the joy of life—will run short.

Meanwhile, as teachers, it is adaptability that we must train, and we must train it by revealing everywhere worthy ends, great purposes, in the steady pursuit of which drudgery is always involved, but as "means only." In the light of this first principle questions of method assume less terrifying proportions. For it is the skilled mechanic who, by his understanding of the machine and its purpose, understands also the various parts and processes, and their relative importance. And it is the child who is once inspired with the desire to read the story for the sake of the story who will learn to read, by a bad method or by none, faster than the child taught by a perfect method, who does not recognise the worth of the end.

But it is time for more definite suggestions, however obvious and commonplace, for the training of adaptability in school. The suggestions must concern both the general organisation and the teaching methods of various subjects.

Under the first head, it seems clear that the more

self-government by the children is found possible, both in school and in playground, the more readily will they recognise the ends of government and be quick to seize on the true purposes of work and play. For the tendency we are combating is the tendency to unthinking conformity and imitation—that travesty of obedience—with its obvious and inevitable counterpart of unthinking rebellion. (Some teachers, perhaps, would be more willing to admit the evil of the former if they recognised its intimate association—its twinship—with the latter. They are but as two sides of the coin.) Both evils are best met by that conscious recognition of ends which is the essence of adaptability. At any rate, let us admit that without the love of order, order is either unattainable or not worth attaining. But, with the recognition of the principle which requires it, order is safe, and of infinite worth, and, where the opportunity is given, the methods of maintaining it are supplied as readily and as variously by the children as by their teachers. An order so maintained will stand the test, dreaded by so many teachers, of change in the circumstances or routine of the school—for it will be based not on imitation, but on adaptability.

And in the second sphere, also, the actual teaching of subjects, adaptability must depend on the child's recognition of the end—of the worth of the knowledge he is told to acquire. Here, as in the question of discipline and organisation, it is his own self-activity that will best reveal the end. Self-teaching of the child, or self-teaching of the class by its own members, is increasingly practised by many schools which are deliberately asserting

the supreme value of adaptability.¹ In some, when it is carried to excess, there is a curious reversion to a back chapter of education, to the ancient ways of the Dame School, and a once more passive teacher listens to the random pedagogic efforts of the children. Thus do extremes meet! Till recently, we have said, comparing the old and the new, "in the old days the scholar stood up and said the lesson to the teacher; now the teacher stands up and says the lesson to the scholars." But in later days still, the former fashion is in some danger of returning, disguised under the strange new semblance of "adaptability." Evidently we have to beware of extravagance on either side, and we shall do so if we fix our eyes not on the method, but on the principle which has directed both reforms.

Here, still on general grounds, the discussion shall break off, leaving to the following chapters the application of the principle of adaptability to the particular subjects of the curriculum. We have attempted to build, as strongly as possible, our first Bridge—to win a genuine acceptance of the principle itself, Adaptability, as being the very substance and fabric of Humanism. It is just because of our real though recent progress on these lines that we are better able now to construct our vision of "what might be."

And "what is?" As an evil legacy of a system

¹ An unusually thorough experiment on these lines is being worked out by Mr. Norman MacMunn in his system of "Differential Partnership." The boys work in pairs, teach each other, and to a very great extent choose their own subjects. [MacMunn, *A Path to Freedom in the Schools.*]

which endured more than thirty years, a system of payment by results, there still lingers in our schools the antique method of the information-pump. And where this survival persists, there must adaptability be at a discount. Therefore, in spite of progress, it remains true that the prevailing excellence of the average school is mechanical, and not human, excellence. Speed and dexterity in an acquired process, a good mechanical memory, a great faculty for conformity, for living, moving, and thinking in herds, a ready regard for external motives of reward and penalty, and a halting regard, if any, for inner motives of interest and appreciation—these are the marks of our schools, and they are the marks of a mechanical excellence, to which Humanism can assign but a low value, simply because they belong to the infra-human levels of life.

Many an individual school stands clear of the charge. It may be that the main body of teachers would repudiate it as unjust even to the average school. But what thorough repudiation is possible, so long as our unreformed factories—embodiments of the evils we profess to combat—are fed and overfed by the acquiescent thousands of our scholars? There, still, is our condemnation.

This, however, we may dare to say, that we, in the schools, are *moving* towards the Humanist ideal of Adaptability and Freedom. And when we have won our fight in the schools, when we have proclaimed our educational ideal of life in terms so plain and strong that the world must hear, then the industrial system must either hasten to bring its own life-ideal into a better conformity with ours, or find itself increasingly coerced through shortage

in the hitherto unfailing supply of human material for all those processes of industry which are in the literal sense "inhuman"—below the level of human faculty.

To this end let us labour in the schools.

FOR REFERENCE

- BEVERIDGE. *Unemployment*. Longmans
 JAMES. *Textbook of Psychology*. Macmillan.
 MACGREGOR. *The Evolution of Industry* Williams and
 Norgate (Home University Library).
 DAILY MAIL. *What the Worker Wants*.
 ELLEN KEY. *The Century of the Child*. Putnam.
 MACMUNN. *A Path to Freedom in the Schools*. Bell.
 MONTESSORI. *The Montessori Method*. Heinemann.
 KERSCHENSTEINER. *The Schools and the Nation*. Macmillan.

CHAPTER IV

HEALTH

THE PRESENT NEED.

THE PHYSICAL BASIS OF EDUCATION—

Mind and Body.

Origin and Validity.

HEALTH IN THE SCHOOL—

I. School Environment.

II. Curriculum.

III. Practical Physical Training.

IV. Theoretical Instruction.

HEALTH OUTSIDE THE SCHOOL.

CHAPTER IV

HEALTH

"We need to begin in the school with healthy classrooms and ample attention to the cleanliness of the children. Housing and workshop conditions can still further be improved, but to a large extent this must be demanded by the people themselves."—*Report of the Medical Officer of Health for Birmingham, 1911.*

WE cannot plead want of knowledge. We have it in either kind, the specialised knowledge of the Medical Profession, and the massive facts which every newspaper every day is blazoning, concerning the life and death, the sickness and the health of the people.

"Year by year the health of the people is more widely discussed, and attempts to improve it become more numerous and more thorough: yet, after all, if we consider it for a moment quite impartially, little that is radical and fearless and of general application has been done. We say that consumption is preventable, but we have only just begun to think, as a nation, of preventing it. We have calculated to a fraction how much disease and death is directly due to overcrowding, want of food and sleep, and lack of knowledge in matters of hygiene: yet we still cling on the whole to the expensive and belated remedies of hospital and asylum and prison, rather than face the initial effort of making our cities habitable places for the men

and women and children who are compelled to work in them. Here and there all that individuals or societies or corporations can do to strike at the roots of social degeneracy is being done, but we are still very far from a combined national effort to efface the evil. The reason is all the more pitiful because it is so very plain. It is that we are, as a nation, only half ashamed of the crippled and diseased products of our modern city-system, and only half in earnest in our attempts to prevent such results in the future.”¹

To the cautious who urge delay (and might with equal reason recommend it in an earthquake), we urge in turn that the risk run by hasty preventive action, though great enough, is trifling in comparison with the gigantic and certain evils of delay. Because of delay we start now with a world thus heavily handicapped. For birth and death do not wait on our delays. And the prolific brood of evils does not cease to multiply with every hour. It is not as if the four dreadful angels of the Apocalypse now stood arrested at the four corners of the earth, their work of wrath suspended at the bidding of the voice, “Hurt not the earth”—till we have done deliberating, till we have found a scheme of reform which the critics shall sanction and the sects agree upon, till we have made the world ready for the new generation. No—into the unready world thousands daily make their unhopeful entrance, doomed, not by birth (for ninety per cent. are born healthy), but doomed by the wrongful environment that awaits them because of our delay.

¹ Barclay Baron, *The Growing Generation*.

MIND AND BODY

We are concerned in this chapter with the physical basis of education and of all life. We had better begin by a sufficient recognition of the bare fact. There are always some who quarrel with it, and condemn as materialist an education or a religion or a life which sets any high value on the body. But Physics, Physiology, Psychology and Fact are nowadays leaving us small choice about accepting the physical basis. It is driven in on us. However much we aspire to a disembodied state we are made to remember, for ourselves and for the world, the feet of clay.

And if we will have it, Philosophy does us good service here by her time-honoured distinction of Origin and Worth—the two kinds of “Nature”; reminding us that a thing is not to be identified with its first beginning only, but with its latter end; that the oak is just as “true” as the acorn, and man just as truly defined by his highest spiritual reach as by the dust from which he was taken. We must accept the physical basis, and perhaps we need not quarrel with it.

Some would insist that validity or worth is at least *more* true than origin, and soul *more* real than body. And there are many Philosophies and many Religions and many Individuals that have travelled far in this faith. We shall be in good company with them. Only we must not substitute for “more real” “the *only* reality.” For we claim for the truest Philosophy that it accepts the reality of Origin as well as of Validity, and for the Chris-

tian Religion that it wins "the Kingdoms of this world," and for the most genuine saint that for him at last there is such a redemption of soul and body that their schism is ended.

"Let us not always say
'Spite of this flesh to-day
I strove, made head, gained ground upon the whole!'
As the bird wings, and sings,
Let us cry 'All good things
Are ours, nor soul helps flesh more, now, than flesh helps soul!'"¹

And this is the faith of Humanism. But the teacher who accepts it, turning to the great unwieldy mass of Health-literature, or to the abstruse subtleties of physiological Psychology, and knowing that all this is within his province, is dismayed. For it is overwhelming in its amount, and it is the work of experts to apply any of it safely. Certainly we must be content to trust the experts; both for their foundational hypotheses, and for their detailed knowledge. But out of the "unwieldy mass" the most essential knowledge lies between these two extremes, and this is more and more becoming available for the world at large and for teachers in particular. And in plain fact there is all the difference, for purposes of helpful reform, between the teacher who has learned and gripped the essentials of School Hygiene and one who has not. The former will in countless ways, apart from regulation, help to provide the right physical basis, both of individual health and fitness and of school-environment. The latter will be helpless in face of such grave difficulties as at present have to be met.

But the teacher has to accept not only this

¹ Browning, "Rabbi Ben Ezra."

general responsibility for the health of the children, but the more definite and stringent declaration of physiological Psychology, that every mental process is both conditioned by nervous process and the cause of physiological change. In plain terms, the action of the mind invariably affects the body, and vice versa. Does this seem to make the giving of a single lesson a matter of almost insupportable responsibility? We can but accept Mr. Barnett's advice: "The physical changes associated with most states of the mind are so complicated and so obscure that the teacher must needs place himself in the hands of the physiologist, and do what he can to learn from physiology what it has to tell him about brain action. He may at all events by this means be able to interpret the signs of physical distress or defect so intelligently as to save himself useless labour and spare his pupil (or patient) useless pain; his judgments will be more accurate, and therefore more humane."¹

HEALTH IN THE SCHOOL

Applied directly to the school and the teacher, the Health question involves four main topics: the school environment, the curriculum in regard to health, direct practical physical training, and direct theoretical instruction.

I. *The School Environment*.—There is, of course, a quite sound and quite unpractical objection, on

¹ P. A. Barnett, *Common Sense in Education and Teaching*, p. 67.

the score of health, to the very existence of School in its present ordinary form. Thus Stanley Hall condemns it wholly for children under eight, and proceeds: "We should transplant the human sapling, I concede reluctantly, as early as eight, but not before, to the school-house with its imperfect lighting, ventilation, temperature. We must shut out nature and open books. The child must sit on unhygienic benches and work the tiny muscles that wag the tongue and pen, and let all the others, which constitute nearly half its weight, decay." ¹

To this condemnation there is a very obvious, though insufficient, reply, that it does not apply to every school, and should not apply to any. Still the general objection of crowded rooms, vitiated air and a too sedentary life does hold good, and is at present unanswerable. We can only say that we are slowly struggling to remove these evils, and that the remedy for them all lies in the reduction of classes. We must ask until we receive. All Health-reforms, if only because they involve individual attention, wait on this. Even if an adequate daily inspection, such as Gorst asks the teacher to make,² of the physical condition of a class of sixty, is possible, and even if "constant vigilance on the part of the teacher" is secured, no efficient treatment and care of individual needs is possible. We may detect, but we cannot cure, until the numbers are reduced.

Other arguments for the reduction of classes on physical grounds are so obvious as to need only the briefest reminder. Eye-strain, ear-strain and voice-

¹ Stanley Hall, *Youth—its Education, Regimen, and Hygiene*.

² Sir John E. Gorst, *Children of the Nation*, p. 123.

strain would be eliminated if all children were within easy range of the blackboard and the teacher's voice. More space for movement with smaller numbers would make possible a more frequent change of position and of occupation as needed, and a more efficient drill or play. This would minimise the ill effects even of "unhygienic desks." All the topics which Gorst includes under School Hygiene—"air, warmth, water, light, desks, playgrounds"—present problems which would be more than half solved by the halving of classes. Meantime the teacher can but keep the six topics steadily in view, patiently reducing the evils as far as possible, and waiting for the reducing of numbers.

But not only waiting. The teacher must make far more use of organised protest. Organised protest against low salaries was a most conspicuous mark of the 1914 N.U.T. Conference, as of many others. The very low salary is an evil, and the protest is just and right. But is it really a greater evil than the daily school environment of the teacher who, for instance, with a class of sixty, has to choose between a poisonous atmosphere and the roar of traffic coming in through open windows and rendering him inaudible? In both cases the wrong is a personal one to the teacher, but the protest against the second is many times more justified and more urgent because it is also the direct wrong done to sixty. Is not this the type of wrong which is entitled to the first place on every teacher's Agenda?

II. *Curriculum and Health*.—Next to the Environment, the whole subject of Curriculum enters into the question of Health. The physical basis of

mental life determines, in the first place, the kind of instruction suited to each age; and this is true whether or not we are inclined to press the theory to its atavistic form as expounded by Stanley Hall and others of the Epoch-rehearsing faith. Whether or not each of us lives again in miniature the life-history of the race, we do normally live through three well-defined epochs before reaching maturity; and of these three epochs of youth all educational theory and practice must take account.

1. The first seven or eight years are rightly years of auto-education, this being nature's method as well as Madame Montessori's, and school is out of place unless it be consecrated to the deliberate helping of such method by provision of right environment.

2. The years from eight to twelve are, because of physiological brain-conditions, "the age of external and mechanical training. Reading, writing, drawing, manual training, musical technic, foreign tongues and their pronunciation, the manipulation of numbers and of geometrical elements, and many kinds of skill have now their golden hour; and if it passes unimproved, all these can never be acquired later without a heavy handicap of disadvantage and loss." ¹

Every teacher will note that, if this second phase so described is indeed a "golden hour," it is so only in view of later hours for which it is a needful preparation. In itself, it is too much dominated by mechanism, and too little capable of training and appreciation to merit the name of education. Herein lies the Elementary Teacher's tragedy. We are

¹ Stanley Hall, *Youth—its Education, Regimen and Hygiene*

beginning to see that it is also the national tragedy. The Elementary Scholar may legally end his "education" before it has begun—just when all the preconditions are satisfied, the groundwork laid, and the purpose of it all within sight.

And the Elementary Teacher resigns his task, saying, if he be in any sense a true educator, "a whole I planned,"¹ and saying it with a bitter sense of unfulfilment.

3. The period of adolescence is the period of revolutionary change, physical, mental and moral. Only revolutionary changes of educational method can meet its need. But this, so far from being matter for regret, is education's boundless opportunity. Now it can proceed straight to its real object, to the very heart of life, to the training of interest, and the appreciation of values. But clearly this involves more drastic change of Time Table and teaching method than any we have so far made, either in Secondary High Schools (where Upper IV and Lower V Forms are so apt to be danger-points for this very cause) or in Elementary Schools. In Glasgow the "Supplementary" year, replacing Standard VII, goes far to meet the need, giving fewer subjects, but a more liberal treatment, and concentrating, for girls, on Literary and Domestic subjects. This means that the mechanical element is lessened, and the two main needs of adolescence in some degree satisfied by the provision of right and real interests and of an outlet for practical energy. The results of such a change of method only seem to show that the change should be more drastic. As far as it goes, it is all to the good;

¹ Browning, "Rabbi Ben Ezra."

but it is recent, and, especially in England, it is slight. It will be interesting to notice, when we have discovered a better education for adolescence, whether there is still such disheartening punctuality in leaving school on the fourteenth birthday. It may be that the movement for extending the school age will then meet with some slight measure of support, or at least with less antagonism from the children themselves and their parents.

Not only the kind of subject included in the curriculum, and its treatment, but the length of lesson must depend on the age and physical fitness of the children. But this point, being long ago recognised, needs no pressing. Rather it needs a little forgetting, for it has been perhaps overdone. The chance of anything like a student's interest and absorption in a subject is greatly hindered by incessant change. Also it is possible that too frequent change involves at least as much nerve strain as its opposite, even with small children. On this point Montessori evidence is very surprising and very significant.

And thirdly, as a guide both to curriculum and method, physiological Psychology is increasingly emphasising the conative quality of all mental process. Action is, by the law of the body no less than by the law of morality, the necessary complement of thought, whether the activity be itself purely mental or external. The double educational corollary of this is, of course, that a large share of manual work is desirable, and that, in all subjects, the "pouring in" method of older days is wrong, and the "Eliciting" method of all true teachers (not its caricatures) is right. But in this last respect

also we are in danger of exaggeration rather than of neglect—at least in our educational theory; and we may well recall Ascham's Humanist counsel to the instructor in Cicero—

“First let him teach the child cheerfully and plainly the cause and matter of the letter.”

By its general environment, and by its manipulation of the curriculum, the School determines the physical well-being or ill-being of its members. But it has more direct methods.

III. *Direct Physical Training*.—This consists of Drill and Games, the former more recognised by the Elementary School than the latter, but less important as training were it not that external conditions (again the excess of numbers and deficiency of space) limit so drastically any worthy development of play. For special and remedial purposes the drilling lesson may be more helpful; but for normal needs the advantage is heavily on the side of free or organised play.

In regard to *Drill*, Stanley Hall's account of the four leading ideals which control the existing systems, will at least help the teacher to frame or modify his own. They are: the ideal of perfect and immediate mental control of physical movement; the ideal of complete development of every physical faculty, known as yet or unknown; the ideal of perfect economy of physical effort through right posture; and the ideal of perfect human form. Of these four, our accepted ideal in the Elementary Schools is the first, the Swedish, and with Sweden we have rejected the accompaniment of music, in order that the mental control may be strengthened by independence of sensuous aid. But, with

Stanley Hall, we must surely deplore this rejection of music, and, since he wrote, his view has gained new and strong confirmation from Eurhythmics, the very principle of which is by music and rhythm to give power to the brain for higher imagination, more perfect control, and more difficult correlations. The fact proved by Eurhythmics is that with such help a degree of control is possible which without it is impossible; and the psychological basis of the fact is the now well-established connection of pleasure and efficiency through the medium of economised attention. Rhythm is the perfect instrument of such economy, and rhythm is intensified by music. It is probable, therefore, that not only pleasure but proficiency in Swedish Drill would be greatly increased by the accompaniment of music, that the degree of mental control would be heightened, and that the "wholesome fatigue" which the lesson usually induces would be replaced by the still more wholesome refreshment which is the alleged effect of Eurhythmics.

Except for the omission of music, the Swedish course, with the syllabus of instructions laid down by the Board of Education in 1909, seems to be one of the wholly right elements in the Curriculum. Nothing less than the complete Humanist ideal is here recognised by the Board, in the statement of the triple aim of the Drilling lesson—physical culture, mental control, and discipline—and in the insistence on pleasure as a prime condition and test of rightness. This is all in the spirit of the best Greek thought, very old in theory, but all too new in our school practice.

But *Play* is the better way. We are slowly win-

ning back our respect for it. (Would the Berlin Play Congress of 1894 have been possible even twenty years earlier?) Experts in Psychology and Medicine, in Art and Sociology, have fully reinstated it, at least in theory. But the average hard-working man, and much more the average hard-working woman, is still apt to dishonour it, to reckon it a gain as well as a fact, that they have "put away childish things," and play among them. They have done so, and therefore they have grown old. The advantage is at least questionable.

Again, in the matter of play the "Origin and Validity" confusion is upon us. Play can be traced, as Stanley Hall traces it, back to dim atavistic instincts, many of them shed for very uselessness as a tadpole sheds its tail. But the history and the meaning of Play end not thus. In its full development, which is its truest "nature," it is the very spirit of the artist and the very method of the genius. It is free and pure expression of personality, creative, imaginative, blending in one perfect activity knowledge and skill, "kennen und können." Such was the play of the Greeks and the art of the Greeks. Such was the play of Fröbel's ideal. Such is the play which Stanley Hall (whose discussion we are largely following) describes as "motor poetry," confirming the saying "Man is whole only when he plays." Remembering these things, we shall give to Play its necessary place in other chapters also, for Health is only one of its achievements. But its Health-value has been, and still is, so disastrously underrated that the fullest treatment seemed called for in this connection.

The actual low level of play, in any school or

street, no more disproves the worth of right play than do prisons disprove the worth of morality or hospitals the worth of health. And for the raising of the level, there are now available for all of us sufficiently clear and sound principles, laid down by experts and worthy of our efforts to apply them.

There is first and most obviously the age-principle, corresponding to that which guides Curriculum, and observing the same three stages. This principle is supposed to ordain, up to seven years, free play, guided but not "organised"; from seven to twelve, organised play of an individualist character, each child matching his skill against that of every other; from twelve upwards organised play on a social basis—team games of every kind. The teacher will probably find this classification of Stanley Hall's a little arbitrary, and will desire to see the social basis laid down at least in the second stage. However, the main importance of the theory is the progress towards the socialised stage. It is all important that this level of skilled and socialised play shall have been reached before school days are over.

For play of older boys and girls in leisure hours, in clubs and parks, another useful and straightforward classification is given by Barclay Baron, under the headings of "Quiet Games" and "Active Games and Sports."¹ Both kinds have their importance for health, and the advantage is not wholly, though of course principally, with the latter. The "Quiet Games," according to their kind of interest, are grouped as Games of Chance, Thinking Games, and Games of Skill, and the first of these

¹ Barclay Baron, *The Growing Generation*.

are ruled out—even in such mild forms as dominoes—by those Club-workers who want to be on the safe side in the moral issue. Thinking Games are probably good, physically, for those who do an unthinking job all day, and so have their right place in any Club of Factory workers. But even for these, and always for School children, the best play is either games of skill, if indoor “Quiet Games” are necessary, or dancing, or active games and sports outside. No one will question the physical benefit of these last for children of school age. “A more than ordinary stillness requires a more than ordinary exercise,” says Mulcaster; and for our want of recognition of this fact 238 Birmingham boys in the year 1913 were charged before the Children’s Court for “Football-playing in Streets.” The Magistrate’s monotonous caution to “play in the proper place, my boy,” and the shilling fine, appear to be singularly ineffective, since the figure for 1912 is 230. We need hardly remark that the trouble is the dearth of playing space and play facilities, in school and out. In the mere obedience to the law of Health, the law of the land is broken.

The claim of dancing is less sure of general recognition. But it is a very strong claim. It has the zealous support of both the writers to whom this chapter is most indebted.¹ They desire for it “a work of rescue and revival,” that it may be again “one of the best expressions of pure play and of the motor needs of youth”; and they claim much positive value, physical and moral, even for the dancing of our days, “degenerate relict” though it

¹ Stanley Hall, *Youth—its Education, Regimen and Hygiene*; Barclay Baron, *The Growing Generation*.

be "with at least but an insignificant culture value, and too often stained with bad associations." If it is true that "we are too devitalised to dance aright," let us win back, together with increased vitality, the dancing which can "cadence the very soul." And where should the work of "rescue and revival" be more fittingly or more hopefully carried on than in our schools, and in our social Clubs for children and adolescents? It is these which can recover the pure joy and health of dancing, free from all the evil associations which have so obscured the issue in many minds.

As usual, the moral and physical values are overlapping. In the "pure joy and health of dancing" we are securing both, and their common source is that cadence or rhythm which is—however little we understand it—in very truth at the central source of our life, giving immortality to just those thoughts, those actions, those plays, which are most rhythmic. Very high in world-literature we place our nursery rhymes for their glory of rhythm—now the rhythm of exhilarated life—

"Rings on her fingers and bells on her toes,
She shall have music wherever she goes"—

now the rhythm of deep rest—

"I love Jenny
Better than any ;
I love Jenny when the sun goes down"—

and all the lullabys.

Long before the words have meaning, and long after the meaning has lost all interest, there is joy of rhythm.

But rhythm is perfected by numbers. It is better

realised by twelve tongues than one, by twenty-four feet than two. Many old English songs and games, long lost, are now reasserting their immortality, chiefly because they combine the joy of rhythm with the joy of social action.

“O ! Madam, I will give to you the bells of Canterbury,
And all the bells of London shall ring to make us merry.
If you will be my joy,
My sweet and only joy
And walk along with me anywhere,”

sing tiny boys in chorus, dancing to meet tiny girls who answer. The “I” is quite merged in the “all of us” who sing.

There is every reason, then, for replacing our modern dances by country dances, old or new, such as those now being revived in Scotland by the Beltane Society, or the Morris dances in England. Both have proved their fitness for Clubs, whether of children or adolescents. They are free from the chief objections urged against other dancing ; and they are more social ; and they are more rhythmic.

The discussion of rhythm, which possibly seems irrelevant or unpractical, is, in fact, neither. It is the real basis of any discussion of dancing, and this is one of our stock problems in social education which we may not shelve. But also it was necessary to this chapter simply because rhythm is health and health is rhythm. More than this, rhythm is the unifying principle of all life, for it is health of spirit as of body, as Plato and Fröbel, and the disciples of each, have striven to set forth. “Right rhythm (*εὐρυθμία*),” says Nettleship,¹ interpreting Plato, “is akin, on the one hand, to the reason,

¹ *Lectures on the Republic of Plato.*

the rhythm and harmony, which is to be traced in the world as a whole, and akin, on the other hand, to what is right and rational in human character." Deep, and far beyond our penetration, lies this central principle of life, giving its mysterious power alike to the nursery rhyme and to the perfect poise of intellect and emotion which we revere in the greatest among men. If we must have recourse to the language of mysticism in attempting to define it, so did Fröbel in his search for the unity of life; and we, like him, may give practical expression to our mysticism by an increased regard for all rhythm and for all rhythmic play.

We have claimed great things, on the score of Health, for play. The risks and evils, which no discussion of the subject can afford to ignore, we maintain do not exist for right play, but only for its perversions. The two chief evils commonly attendant on it are (i) a gambling interest, and (ii) a purely spectacular interest. But the first is extrinsic interest, interest in money or some other prize, not in the achievement of skill. The answer to the objection and the cure of the evil was long ago provided by the laurel wreath. And it will be admitted that much of the spectacular interest in play is also a gambling interest and extrinsic. If not, it is often the same lazy, passive interest as that of the Cinema-goer, and equally to be condemned. A wakeful, skilled interest in skilled play is a good thing, but rare, except in those who take their share in playing. And any discussion of play on the ground of Health must rule out the mere spectator.

Play in our meaning is always active, and the

interest in it is an intrinsic interest—in the game for the game's sake, and for the sake of developed skill and a realised self. We believe that normally, and certainly with children, this interest is greater and stronger than the other extrinsic interests, and that with proper facilities for play the risks and evils of extrinsic interest will disappear.

It may still be urged that the intrinsic interest itself has dangers, and that the genuine devotee of the game for the game's sake is liable to physical strain and mental narrowing. None of us loves the man who is unmitigated muscle. But the life which the Humanist is to educate is the life of perfect proportion, and the games of a Humanist School or College could never fall under this condemnation while the ideal was kept in view. The "too much" objection is always with us, but at present the Elementary Teacher will be disposed to smile if it comes his way. Not on this side does the danger of disproportion lie for our Elementary Schools.

IV. *Direct Theoretical Instruction.*—Hygiene has only recently secured a firm place in the curriculum—sometimes under the name of science. Its recency must save us from despair if the child proceeds straight from the Hygiene lesson into a home where every law of health is daily broken. We need not despair, for the systematic instruction is a new thing with this generation. But we must not acquiesce. And here is fresh and flagrant proof of the necessity of an extended school age, if, as is alleged, the younger members of the St. Pancras School for Mothers admit that they have indeed learnt as school-girls many of the rudiments of healthy diet and the like, but have in the

interval between school and marriage forgotten them all. Either by an extended school-age or by continuation classes the teaching of hygiene must be carried on beyond the fourteenth year. Then we may hope that, by prolonged and ceaseless repetition and insistence, the ideas of clean and healthy living may be incarnated in the persons and homes of the children.

The motor ideas are positive ideas, not prohibitions. The evils of dirt, overcrowding, drink, juvenile smoking, and all vicious excess can only be attacked by the invading hosts of good, by the positive love, growing inevitably with growing knowledge, of clean and pure conditions. It is this *appreciation of good through knowledge of good* that is being promoted by the direct instruction given now in the Elementary Schools. In the science lessons of the girls there is clear, sympathetic and practical treatment of the actual difficulties and risks which beset life in a poor and crowded home. And there is definite and carefully graded teaching and learning of sound rules and remedies. The course, which is given by specially qualified travelling teachers or, as sometimes in Scotland, by women doctors, normally includes such subjects as foodstuffs, diet, common ailments, infant ailments, care of infants, personal hygiene. For the older girls it is commonly supplemented in a perfectly natural and easy sequence by one or two special lessons on sex-hygiene, with the approval of the parents, who are invited to attend. One who has heard the lessons, and also the strong expressions of approval by other teachers, can only deeply regret the recent decision of the London

Elementary Education Sub-Committee to exclude class-teaching of sex-hygiene. The alternative adopted, the distribution by leaflets of "Information for the use of girls on leaving school" seems to prolong just that dangerous element of mystery and dark reserve which the frank presentation of the subject in class does most happily remove.

The whole Science and Hygiene course given to girls seems eminently Humanist in its purpose and eminently successful in its power to arouse living interest. It is supplemented by much fuller training in Domestic Subjects, in Cookery, Laundry and Housewifery—all too recently established to display their results, but sufficient even now, by their combined service in restoring the physical ideal of Humanism, to justify the hope that the worst days of the slum are numbered.

But the school that by pure environment, sound curriculum, generous play and helpful teaching has cared for the health of its children, may still be baffled by outside forces. The bad home and the bad street may undo the work. Often the fight of the school for the child's health must seem a losing fight, against such facts as those given by Mr. Rowntree in his study of poverty in York¹—the eighty-eight per cent. badly housed, the nearly thirty per cent. below the Poverty Line, the drink expenditure averaging 6s. a week per family, "the 474 families earning less than the sum required for food only at workhouse rate." In the light of these facts the school can hardly be held responsible for the additional fact that fifty-two per cent. of the

¹ Rowntree, *Poverty*.

school children of the worst area in York were found in bad physical condition.

But therefore, for the achievement of its own proper work, the school must look abroad and call to its side every helpful agency. And the teacher who values his own profession must inevitably ally himself in sympathy, and in active co-operation wherever possible, with every sound movement of social reform which seeks to raise the health-level of the community. He in his school centre stands between the child's home and the child's industrial employment. Too often both of these are arrayed against him, surrounding the school environment with a wider environment of wrong. But there are other forces. If the teacher rightly reckons the Public House and the sporting paper his foes for the child's sake, he may equally find in every Health Visitor, every Adult School, every branch of the Workers' Educational Association, every good Club, his ally, for the child's sake. More especially must he welcome the reinforcements of the Care Committee—no insignificant ally when, for instance, in London it numbers several thousand workers, and is able to organise not only the feeding of necessitous children and the medical care of all, but also schemes for employment after school, for recreation, and for home visiting. Through all such humanist agencies moving in the adult world he must seek to save his labours in the school from perishing, and with them he must help to redeem the physical basis of life.

FOR REFERENCE

- STANLEY HALL. *Youth—its Education, Regimen and Hygiene.* Appletons.
- BARCLAY BARON. *The Growing Generation.* Student Christian Movement.
- GORST. *The Children of the Nation.* Methuen
- PEPLER. *The Care Committee, the Child, and the Parent.* Constable.
- JAMES. *Textbook of Psychology.* Macmillan.
- WELTON. *The Psychology of Education.* Macmillan.
- BARNETT. *Common Sense in Education.* Longmans.
- CLOUDESLEY BRERETON. *Studies in Foreign Education.* (Physical Education in France.) Harrap.
- REPORTS—*Report of Second Guildhall School Conference on Diet, Cookery and Hygiene—Rearing an Imperial Race.* Hecht.
- Report of Committee on Physical Deterioration, 1914.*
- Report of First Medical Inspection of School Children.* Wyman.
- Report of Chief Medical Officer of Board of Education* (Sir George Newman). Cd. 7730.

CHAPTER V

CURRICULA—GENERAL PRINCIPLES

THE DOUBLE TEST OF A CURRICULUM—

The Test of Humanist Theory (Chap. II).

„ „ Human Experience (Chap. IX).

THE FIRST TEST—CLASSIFICATION OF SUBJECTS—

(a) According to elements of human nature, Physical, Mental and Moral.

(b) As Utility-Subjects or Culture-Subjects.

(c) As having Direct or Indirect Value.

CHAPTER V

CURRICULA—GENERAL PRINCIPLES

“Knowledge is the best friend of man—Ignorance is his greatest foe.”—ARABIC.

“Of education information itself is really the least part.”—BUTLER.

WE come back from wide ranging over Humanist principles, and from the general discussion of the physical basis of education, to the plain question, “What shall be taught?” Accepting these principles, we have to bring them into everyday use, and express them in a Time Table. How?

The following commonplaces seem necessary to clear the ground. A curriculum must be judged by some criterion. It may be the criterion of theory, or it may be the criterion of external facts. We may ask: Is the Time Table of a school constructed to meet the real needs of education, as interpreted by the greatest educators, or, is it so constructed that the children of that school, after nine years’ application of it, prove themselves well fitted for life? But of course the more the genuine Humanist is convinced of his theory, the more he will demand that his work shall be judged, not by the first test, but by the second.

Both tests are hard to apply with any fairness.

Not every unsuccessful after-life is fairly attributable to a faulty Time Table at School or College. And as long as Oxford and Cambridge turn out at least as high a percentage of failures—*i. e.* of anti-social inefficients—as many of the Elementary Schools, we cannot pin our faith to the mere label of Humanism attached to any curriculum. Both tests are hard to apply. The subjects which most express and promote Humanism for one age may fail of their purpose for another. Compulsory Greek in the twentieth century may well be opposed by Humanists as keenly as by Utilitarians. It is not curricula, but only the principles of curricula, that can safely be transmitted from one generation to another.

There is another needful commonplace. It is not the subject, but the treatment of the subject, that really determines the character of the education given. The most utilitarian subject is Humanism in the hands of the Humanist, and vice versa. An Arithmetic lesson of to-day, plainly directed towards helping the 25/- income of a working man to do its weekly miracle, or an Arithmetic lesson of the days of Alcuin, designed for the deliberate and original purpose of giving "certainty to the solemnity of Easter's return," both of them being in vital relation to the individual and social need of their time, rank as Humanist studies far higher than Grey's *Elegy* "taught" or "paraphrased" without sympathy or interest or reverence, and chosen out of regard neither for literature nor life, but only for the Inspector.

Once more, then, the tests, both of theory and practice, are hard to apply, and no Time Table—

not the most giddy nor the most glum—is to be condemned off-hand. Nevertheless it is true that the curriculum of the Elementary School does tend to shock both those who apply to it the test of theory and those who apply to it the test of life. Among the latter, the Poor Law Commissioners of 1909 are conspicuous. Even though it has been remarked¹ that their treatment of the educational aspect of their problem is the weakest part of the report, they are constrained to “refer to one criticism that has been made with almost absolute unanimity. There seems to be outside the circle of the teaching profession a very strong general feeling that the education of our children in the elementary schools is not of the kind which is helpful to them in after life. . . .

“We would suggest to the Board of Education the advisability of meeting these criticisms by a thorough reconsideration of the Time Table and curriculum in our elementary schools, as well as of the aims and ideals of Elementary Education.”²

Our business in this chapter is with the first test. We have to set the curriculum of the Elementary School side by side with the theory of Humanism. The second test, latent as we have said throughout, will be the explicit subject of the ninth chapter.

On what broad view of human nature and human life does every sound curriculum rest? It rests first on the age-long distinction of Body and Soul; then on the recognition, within Soul, of two elements, an intellectual and a moral, the

¹ J. H. Muirhead, *By What Authority?*

² Majority Report of the Poor Law Commission, 1909.

first apprehending facts, the second appreciating values.

SELF	
I. BODY	II. SOUL
A. Intellect Apprehension of facts.	B. Feeling and Will. Appreciation of Values.

For all these elements of human nature Humanism requires recognition and provision through the curriculum.

The Elementary School Time Table does claim to make provision for them all. The Authority, Central or Local, requires normally Physical Training and Recreation, the three R's supplemented by certain Class Subjects, and Religious Knowledge.

In what proportion? Of the total twenty-seven and a half hours available per week, Physical Training and Recreation receive normally a nominal three hours and a half, and Religious Knowledge two hours and a half. The remainder goes to secular instruction. That is, using the Table, I and II B together claim six hours (less than a quarter of the whole), II A claims twenty-one and a half for itself. It is to be realised also that the six hours are just those which in practice are most encroached upon by school routine. The half-hour's daily play and the half-hour's daily religious instruction are pure fiction, not brought within the experience of any child in the Elementary School.

Why this proportion? Granted that Humanist principles may penetrate the whole; granted that Humanist teaching does not admit of measurement by hours and minutes, it still must remain incred-

ible that Humanism can tolerate such an overwhelming preponderance of intellectualism. Our Time Table at least requires some explaining.

The explaining is in fact easier than the justifying. It is true that the modern elementary school system arose out of a most genuine educational life-impulse, and that the motive force behind it was the devout and democratic passion of Lancaster and Bell. But it arose in an age of materialism; it was solidified in a conflict between two anti-educational forces, the utilitarian and the sectarian; it received its deepest impress from the most anti-educational of all the Codes (that of 1861); and it succumbed at the very outset to the problem of unwieldy numbers. The last cause alone is explanation enough. From that day to this the unwieldy size of classes has done its evil work, in stifling the life of teacher and taught, and transmuting even the heart-beats of Humanism into the clicking of machinery. But all these causes conspired against the physical and moral well-being of the nation's children, and combined to give to the Knowledge Idol a swift and sweeping ascendancy over the whole domain of Elementary Education.

Slowly since 1870, more rapidly since 1906, that idol is being displaced from its autocracy. But, so far from being entitled to any complacency, we have still to make up leeway from the desperate days preceding the Factory Acts. One pays dear for a child-holocaust of half a century. And it would seem the barest common sense, realising this, to pay quickly, and for these present years to require of the curriculum of every grant-earning school, Secondary and Elementary, the strongest

emphasis on physical training, hygiene, and courses in domestic subjects, until there is nowhere any gross defilement of the standard of clean living; to place the emphasis here until in no class of society will the mind of the nation tolerate either gross luxury or gross neglect. But even the 1912 Code only gives this needful emphasis in the case of Infants. Its first paragraph, stating with gravity the Board's view of "the purpose of the Public Elementary School," omits altogether the physical aim, which is added, with the suggestion almost of an afterthought, in the third.

Then, as to Element II B, a later chapter will contend that moral teaching has fared worst of all. It could not and cannot come to its own while sectarianism and utilitarianism join forces against it, while the Knowledge Idol oppresses it, while classes of sixty make the individual a thing of slight account in the eyes of his teacher, his fellows and himself. There is a vague belief, in which those who do not know our schools from within may continue, if they wish, to rest content, that this training is provided for by the Religious Knowledge lesson. It is not. To judge by the prevailing title and the prevailing method of the lesson, it is not even intended to provide for it. It is one more of the "knowledges," one more set of facts or formulæ, whether from Bible or from Catechism, for the most part retaining to-day the character it bore (perhaps of sheer necessity then) in the days of Lancaster and Bell. It is in itself no more a training in values—no more, therefore, a moral training—than is any other set of facts or formulæ. The Lancastrian teacher who, with the aid of child-monitors and

the Elliptical Method, "taught" two hundred children that "Abraham went up a high —," may have heard with intense gratification the two hundred voices shout "mountain." But he was not teaching either morals or religion. He was not training the sense of values. Indeed, as the writer knows from repeated experience, the topic in the illustration just quoted¹ is peculiarly adapted to confound the moral sense in regard to God's estimate of human life.

It is very needful, then, at the outset of a discussion which seeks broadly to refer the subjects of the curriculum to their appropriate element in human nature, to protest against this conventional view, which, while labelling Religion as a "knowledge," still expects it to give an infallible training in values, and is content, moreover, to give it a monopoly for this purpose. The point is perfectly vital. If Religious Knowledge can do this thing, and if "secular" subjects cannot or do not, then it should have, of the ten thousand hours of elementary school life, not the one-fifty-fifth assigned (reduced in practice to less than one-hundredth), but nine-tenths. If, on the other hand, it fails to do this thing, if it is indeed but one of the "Knowledges," then neither Cowper-Templeism nor Denominationalism need vex themselves for its inclusion at all.

At this point the Humanist protest cannot be suppressed. Training in values, in appreciation, in morality, in religion—these things are the life-substance not of "Religious Knowledge" only,

¹ Prideaux, *Survey of Elementary English Education*, p. 24.

but of all sound knowledge; they are the theme not of one lesson only, but, implicitly, of the whole curriculum. This is the whole faith of Humanism, and the whole contention of the present chapter.

But this is the plain, grievous fact concerning our schools, that, because the Knowledge Idol has so invaded the whole curriculum, neither by the religious lessons nor by the secular has this training, on which individual and national well-being most depend, been adequately bestowed. Our curriculum is pre-eminently a scheme of knowledges, still, in spite of protests and of progress, vastly underrating physical and moral training.

The protests and the progress are our hope. It matters little if Mr. Holmes is too busy with the first to do justice to the second, for the journey to "What-Might-Be" is a far journey, and it is the non-protesting, just now, who delay it. But it is plain that it is just towards the restoring of the Humanist balance in the curriculum that the Board of Education is working—positively, by the rapid development of schemes for physical amelioration, negatively, by the removal of restrictions from the teacher's work, and the steady depreciation of the uniformity ideal in favour of an enlightened liberty. The Board, in truth, is constructing an increasingly Humanist scheme of education—and each recent reform brings the scheme into a more reasonable conformity with the stated aim "to enable the children not merely to reach their full development as individuals, but also to become upright and useful members of the community in which they

live, and worthy sons and daughters of the country to which they belong.”¹

If, then, the spirit of the scheme is inoperative as yet over a vast proportion of the Elementary School world—if this great area is still as the valley of dead men’s bones, a scene of dead conformity to the letter of the Code even after the letter is erased—the cause can no longer be sought where, after 1861, Matthew Arnold rightly sought it, in the direct anti-educational work of the Central Authority.² We are to seek it and find it now in two other directions—in the excessive size of the classes, and in the conservatism of a large section of the teachers. The first cause, being matter of universal agreement, needs no comment. Only it must doggedly reappear in the discussion just as often as the educational issue does really hinge on this external condition; and that is at every point and always. The second cause applies to those teachers who, themselves the product of a bad educational tradition (for thirty-six years of Payment by Results are not quickly cancelled), are content to perpetuate that tradition. They are slow to realise that now, in their day, education is facing great and vital reforms, that the men and women of the new spirit have in this generation discarded the educational grooves of twenty years back as thoroughly as they have discarded horse-cars and oil-lamps; that the choice for themselves is indeed the choice between dimness and light. And we must repeat the contention of the first chapter, that with the teachers rests the main responsibility for that other main hindrance, so long as their great

¹ 1912 Code.

² Reports on Elementary Schools.

and powerful organisation¹ underrates the *educational* importance of the question of the size of classes, and gives ground for the serious accusation recently brought against the National Union of Teachers, that with it "the teacher is the first consideration and the school the second."² Bitterly unjust to many individual teachers is this charge. But these, fighting for reform year after year, find their efforts frustrated not only by Local Authorities and Inspectors, but by the votes of their own Union, which should be at once their best means of expression, and their most powerful instrument of achievement. Because of this, the charge seems just, even in its extreme gravity, that the National Union of Teachers "does an incalculable amount of harm by considering the good of the individual teacher above that of education."³

The discussion of curriculum has been based, so far, on the division of human nature into two main factors, body and soul, the second being subdivided into an intellectual and a moral factor. Humanism requires the right and reasonable balancing of these in any scheme of education. But it is no less true that Humanism regards with profound disfavour all sectional treatment of life's unity; it distrusts all Faculty-Philosophy; it dislikes a curriculum of watertight compartments; it would have every lesson directed towards the benefit of the whole nature, though with difference of method and of emphasis. And this is the Humanism of Plato. Though the picture-language of the myths represents the elements not only as separate, but as

¹ The National Union of Teachers.

² Egerton, *The Future of Education*, p. 251.

³ *Ibid*

antagonistic, his deliberate claim for education is that it shall develop the whole "nature" of man into a perfect unity, giving supremacy where alone supremacy is "natural," *i. e.* to the spiritual element which rules in the interests of all. The Board of Education to-day, asserting in its valuable Handbook of Physical Training that the purpose of such training is moral and intellectual as well as physical, is simply re-stating Platonism, and the Platonic repudiation of a watertight-compartment curriculum.

The danger of such sectional education is a very real one, as teachers will readily admit, whether in Secondary and High Schools, which too often pay this excessive price for their Specialists, or in Elementary Schools where—despite the correlation craze—the teacher with his class makes every day a succession of fearful leaps from one disconnected topic to another. It would seem desirable, therefore, not to construct an educational theory solely on the basis of this first and most obvious classification, but to supplement it by others.

A second broad classification might group all subjects of the curriculum under the two heads of Utility and Culture, the former including all "necessary" training for livelihood, the latter all (unnecessary?) training for a fuller life. And this classification at once plunges us into the difficulty of defining such words as "necessary" and "utility," and forces us to admit the vagueness of our thinking in regard to our genuine purpose in educating. It drives us back to Aristotle, either to accept or to reject his Humanist creed that the aim is "not mere life, but the good life." Nor is

it the principle, only, of this classification that is difficult, but its application to particular subjects. Where, for example, shall we place the drilling lesson, or the reading lesson? Both are "useful" to the point of sheer necessity, but the former grows, without change of principle, into dancing or Eurhythmics, and the latter may revel in Keats. But in fact these difficulties are themselves illuminating. They are one more protest against a sectional aim and a mutilated humanity. All the utility subjects rise under skilled hands to the culture-level; and the hall-mark of perfect culture is a perfect utility. And if Humanism could be defined in a phrase, it might be defined as the identification of utility and culture, of the necessary and the desirable.

One more classification may be attempted. Some subjects contribute directly and obviously to human completeness, to utility and culture together; others, called by Lord Avebury the "knife and fork studies," less directly and less obviously. This classification, the result of which is to claim recognition for all subjects of the curriculum on their own merits *except the three R's*, may rouse the greatest criticism, but nevertheless seems most able to pass any Humanist test. The three R's have been made pre-eminent in a scheme of education which ends at the fourteenth birthday simply because they are the keys to unlock realms of knowledge which that short period has not time to reveal. Themselves of indirect value, they are the introduction to the Direct Values. They are not the only keys, but, if they are the best fitting and the most available, their pre-eminence in the Time

Table is justified, *so long as they do unlock the desired doors.* And no longer. We certainly need to test this more honestly and more often. We need to remember, on the one hand, the educational triumphs which have been achieved without them, or without their normal use—witness the Homeric poems and Helen Keller. On the other hand, we need to scrutinise the actual use made of the keys by thousands who possess them to-day. What part do they play in the average day of the average girl in an average factory?

We shall probably conclude, after each fresh testing, that the three R's are the readiest keys to all the Direct Values, and their possession desirable for every normal being, but that they are not a positive necessity, nor an absolute condition of all culture, and that their prolonged monopoly of the curriculum, to the neglect of other keys, is wholly unjustified by results. "Results" are, of course, published broadcast through the land, so that he who runs may read. But for their more accurate statement we should refer to sociological studies, such as Mrs. Bell's careful inquiry into the actual leisure-reading of the working-class households in Middlesborough.¹

The conclusions reached by such special inquiries are depressing. Against them we may set the recent growth of cheap and popular editions of good authors, and the spread of Free Libraries. But it is doubtful how far Elementary Schools have directly created the demand for these things. Indirectly they have done so, as providing the ladder to Secondary Schools and Universities for many

¹ *At the Works.*

who would otherwise fall short of the Direct Values. The contention here is that even the majority of boys and girls whose education ends at fourteen do fall short of these Values.

If so, the Elementary School curriculum is at present, for the majority of those concerned, unjustified. It is devoted mainly to the Indirect Values, and it does not ensure access to the Direct. Such a conclusion suggests a double line of reform—either a considerable change in the Time Table, and the displacing of the three R's from their position of dominance, or such a change in method and in the conception of the end in view that the Indirect Values shall go straight to their mark, and cease to masquerade as themselves the goal of education.

By a consideration of each subject on its own merits, the next chapter may help to show how both reforms may be realised, and how they are in fact being realised, however slowly, in many schools, as far as external conditions allow.¹ More and more are the subjects of Direct Value finding their rightful recognition on the old Humanist ground, "not that they do not all serve in some manner to the instruction and rise of life, but let us make a choice of those which directly and professedly serve to that end."

We know that such selection has to be a very drastic process for the Elementary School, and

¹ The Head of a large Infants' School comments thus on her own Time Table: "This distribution is governed in some particulars by the fact that at *all* times two classes of sixty have to occupy the large room. The Time Table must be shaped to meet that circumstance."

often what is saved seems little and base compared with all that is of necessity rejected. We have to reject, even when the three R's are forced to relinquish some of their territory, so many desirable subjects, all claiming a place on the score of Direct Value. And we can but make use of the principle just quoted, and go on rejecting the "less direct" for the sake of the "more direct." Thus our position, in regard, for instance, to the inclusion of a foreign language in the Elementary curriculum, must still be that of Mulcaster when he ruled out Latin in favour of the vernacular; "It is a question not of disgracing Latin, but of gracing our own language."

But, having applied as wisely as we may the hard principle of selection, we can infinitely enrich our meagre results by the complementary principle of correlation. We can only teach a few subjects, but we can make each stand for the universe, as did Tennyson's flower.¹ It is no figure of speech. The same laws are at work in every branch of knowledge, and are recognised most quickly when each subject is related, first to those with which its connection is simplest and closest, and then to the world beyond. The abuse of correlation in school is never due to this wider recognition of unity, but often to the artificial forcing of connection between distant points, *without* the wider recognition of the whole which contains them. Hence caricatures are fairly frequent. A modern Sunday School seeking to connect Nature Study and Bible Study has lately included, among its pairs of "correlated" objects, Daniel and the Queen

¹ "Flower in the crannied wall."

Wasp, Catkins and the Good Samaritan. If common sense does not save us from these distortions, we may test our correlations by the general rule not to look for them exactly in those qualities which distinguish the different levels of creation from each other—not, for instance, to apply moral laws to natural objects.

Helped, then, by sound correlation, we are to make the selected subjects of the curriculum fulfil their utmost service. And the selection, as we have seen, must be based on the principle of Direct and Indirect Value. Accepting this classification of subjects as less unsatisfactory than others, we turn to the separate discussion of each subject of the Elementary School curriculum.

CHAPTER VI

CURRICULA—THE DIRECT AND INDIRECT VALUES

A. THE INDIRECT VALUES—

Reading.
Writing.
Arithmetic.

B. THE DIRECT VALUES—

English.
History.
Geography.
Nature Study and Science.
Domestic Subjects.
Needlework.
Drawing and Painting.
Manual Work.
Music.

CHAPTER VI

CURRICULA ¹—THE DIRECT AND INDIRECT VALUES

A. THE INDIRECT VALUES

READING

So classified, the Reading lesson must be regarded as the training of mechanical skill in the process, not as the teaching of literature. As Literature, it is at once transferred to the Direct Values; and the number is happily increasing of those teachers who do in practice so transfer it. Yet the title of the "Reading" lesson remains unchanged, for the most part, even in Standard VII—a survival, surely, of the days when the three R's bounded the horizon, and when scholars above the age of ten were a select minority too small for separate consideration. And this daily lesson is still, in countless instances, contenting itself with the Indirect Value and the lesser good. The Direct Value, the growth of living interest in a world of daily increasing worth, is too often out of sight altogether, both for teacher and taught. Or, more often still, it is present in the mind of the teacher as a luxury, not as the real essential.

¹ In accordance with the plan of the book (see Chap. I), Physical Training is dealt with in Chap. IV, Religious Knowledge in Chap. VII.

The criticism is not made lightly. It is based on the striking inability, many times observed, in many classes, to render an intelligent account of what has just been read with fluency. There is glib reading and vacant thought. The Direct Value has somehow perished. The mechanical faculty has been perfected; the utilitarian end—the passing of the Standards and the qualifying for factory, shop, warehouse, or much-coveted “office”—is served. The cost in time has been something like nine hundred and fifty hours in the Senior School, besides perhaps four hundred in the Infants’!¹ Considering the inexhaustible facilities now available, in the shape of Readers, Apparatus and “Methods,” a protest would surely be justified against this heavy bill of Time, were not the said facilities more than counteracted by the size of the class.

But, historically, Reading, with Writing, arose from an unmitigated and purely practical interest in the thing to be conveyed from one mind to another. Picture-writing was the primitive effort to convey it. Picture-reading, dependent on the artistic proficiency of the writer, as well as on the imagination and skill of the interpreter, proved precarious, and the system of fixed literary symbols grew up to remedy this. The origin of Reading was the sheer need of a safe communication of experience or of ideas.

And, again, historically, the spread of reading in Europe was due, not to facilities, for there were none, nor to utilitarian motives, for the scholar for the most part flung away his money with his ease. It was due to a vast emotional, artistic, and religious

¹ More than this, if spelling, etc., is included.

impulse. It was due to the Renaissance, and the Renaissance was the opening of the eyes of men to the Direct Values. Under stress of that impulse men would go all lengths to find their spiritual sustenance and their means of self-expression. Therefore they would read, and therefore they would write—in letters of Latin and letters of Greek, which alone in that day could serve their need—undeterred by dearth of texts and dearth of teachers.

On those who deny all fitness to the comparison of Renaissance scholars with Elementary School children rests the burden of proving that the motive force which made the task possible for the former is without avail for the latter. But at least let every teacher admit that the best motive force for every Reading lesson in every age is one and the same, viz. the recognition of the Direct Value which reading serves.

The charge, then, against our Elementary Schools, allowing for many exceptions, is that the Reading lesson is not justifying itself by securing the Direct Values; and that therefore a change is needed, either by a drastic reduction of the 1350 hours devoted to it, or by a modification of method so that the Direct Values may be secured throughout the process. Both changes, in fact, seem altogether possible. The successful Infants' School (in some cases relying on the Direct Values throughout) has given evidence enough that the technical process can be mastered by the age of seven. On the other hand, where it is deliberately postponed, as in the Primary School at New Earswick, until the seventh year, a single year generally seems to

make good the delay.¹ But in any case, it is agreed that the normal child of eight can be master of his Primer. If so, for him the path is straight and fair to the Direct Values. The boredom of the Reading lesson in the Upper School is a needless and unjustifiable boredom. It is due to the prolonging of the Indirect Value long after it should have been replaced by the Direct.

For the hastening of the mechanical process, the successful methods, both of teaching and organisation, are perhaps as many as the successful teachers. Complete enumeration is impossible, nor is it desirable, seeing that experiment is better than imitation. But it may be worth while to concentrate into a few paragraphs the most outstanding points which characterise, or are suggested by, the most successful Reading lessons—the practical problem being, of course, one that ought not to exist, viz. how to sustain the attention, interest, and progress of fifty-nine children while a single child is reading.

¹ Postponement of Reading has also been emphatically urged at the 1914 Conference of Educational Associations, on the double ground of historical theory and practical experience. "Surely we are all agreed," says the speaker, "that it should have *no* place in the kindergartens, and little, if any, in infant schools." It is to be feared that at present the agreement is far from universal. But it well might be, if the main condition here stated were universally desired—a class of about a dozen children. The positive evidence adduced, valuable in spite of being very limited, is that, given this condition, together with "homes where speech was clear and beautiful," children who did not begin to learn till the close of their sixth year became fluent readers in twenty-four or thirty-six weeks, with a daily lesson of twenty minutes. That is, the thing required was achieved in one-eighth of the time expended on it in many an Infant School—in something like fifty hours instead of four hundred.

In regard to organisation, then—

I. Avoid at all costs the prolonged misery and strain of listening to bad reading. If necessary to this end, allow time to *prepare*, allotting the various paragraphs, so that the lesson may begin with a fair standard, and the unprepared reading be gradually brought into line.

II. With junior classes, provide sufficient “extrinsic interest” to supplement the “intrinsic”—*i.e.* give motives for excelling, using as far as possible co-operative instead of competitive motives.¹ Kindle always the desire for entrance into those realms which only the Reading-key can unlock. Was not Comenius’ thought a wise one—to inscribe above the door of the Vestibular, the lowest class in the school of Pansophy, the words: “Let no one enter here who cannot read”?

Nevertheless rely mainly on intrinsic interest throughout. Thus, of the following very simple and familiar devices for the Reading lesson, the order of merit would seem to be—

1. The provision of just that Reader or story in which the class as a whole can be absorbed, preferably in dramatic form, with characters assigned. (Intrinsic and co-operative interest.)
2. The giving of a written personal direction or message to a child to be carried out so soon as he can read it. (Intrinsic individual interest.)

¹ For the terms here used, see Welton’s *Educational Psychology*, or any *Psychology for Teachers*.

3. The competition of different *groups* of children for the least number of mistakes or failures. (Extrinsic and co-operative interest.)
4. The individual challenge to be able to read by a certain date." (Extrinsic individual interest.)

III. To meet the common difficulty of a large class containing children of very different degrees of proficiency, group them into three sets and encourage the C's to disappear into the B's, the B's into the A's. Give frequently to the A's the privilege of silent reading, or of helping the C's. All sections gain by differentiated treatment of this kind, and a clear recognition of standards.

IV. Make much use of poetry, which both claims a higher standard, and facilitates it by rhyme and rhythm.

In regard to Teaching-methods, those in actual use and justified by success, may be naturally grouped as follows—

I. Those which rely mainly on sound ("word-building" from *single letters or syllables*).

II. Those which rely mainly on sight (the word as a whole being the unit).

III. Those which rely mainly on memory (the old "spelling" lesson).

IV. Those which rely on combinations of these.

The last method is the best attested in experience, being often employed by successful teachers who profess adherence to no method at all. They are, in fact, exercising the Psychological law of economy, achieving by *harmony* of two sense-perceptions more than twice the result of the isolated activity of one. But hitherto in England the

economy has ceased here. It is the introduction of a third sense, and the co-operation of touch with sight and sound, that distinguishes the Montessori Reading method and gives it superior speed and ease. Because of this co-operation of faculties and of interests, this superior ease and speed are achieved by just that system which makes reading most casual and incidental, assigning to it neither a set hour nor an age-limit. The Montessori child, satisfied with a long spell of handwork, comes up with a request for "a Red Reader," sits down and silently reads, or copies on the board, often translating for himself the printed letters into script. More English and American evidence is needed for a fair comparison with the Italian rate of progress and a right estimate of the difficulty of a non-phonetic language. But the short experience as yet available goes to show that the English Montessori child, with far less time and far less teaching than his fellows in ordinary schools, either equals or surpasses them in the speed and ease with which he learns to read. If this is true, there are two clear reasons to account for it—the economy achieved by co-operation of faculties, and the unhindered working of pure intrinsic interest.

WRITING

As communication of thought, Writing is just the complement of Reading, the two together making the best-known substitute for speech. In view of the prevailing standards of English conversation in almost every section of society, it might be well if training in speech received some share of the time now lavished in schools upon the substitute. On the other hand, as a form of expression requiring manual dexterity, Writing challenges comparison with other forms, and especially with Drawing. It would seem to have little independent existence. Inserted between the other two R's, like the dormouse between its more aggressive neighbours, it perhaps owes its long security on the Time Table to the fact that it was often overlooked and very somnolent. Certainly the ordinary Writing lesson is among the most reposeful in a big Elementary class, and the writing produced is the most perfect illustration of sleeping conformity.

It will be enough to summarise recent criticisms and reforms, and comment on their combined significance.

I. The original close connection with Reading should be recovered, if lost. As one complex method of communication, Reading and Writing should be taught simultaneously, or, more logically, precedence should be given to Writing, as the making of the picture precedes the interpretation. The picture-letter of the Homeric hero who sent to his foe "many direful signs" must have been a

great incentive to correct reading. And as Drawing quickens Nature Study, so does the attempt to fashion the letters quicken the recognition of them in Reading. This is the general, though not the universal, order of preference in a Montessori School.

II. As training in manual dexterity, Writing, for young children, compares unfavourably with Drawing. The restricted movements and the difficult implements are both in its disfavour. But these evils can be minimised, as in a Montessori school, by bold and free writing and by much preliminary training in simpler, guided movements, with chalk, insets, sandpaper letters, and blackboard.

III. Beyond the point of legibility, speed, and neatness, practice in handwriting as such should be reduced to a minimum. The Code's brief instruction even omits the third of these, thereby most clearly restricting the subject to its Indirect Value. But here again the Montessori method has proved illuminating. While reducing the time-expenditure more than any other method, it includes beauty as well as legibility in the aim, and no part of the Montessori work is better attested than the excellence—not the mere efficiency—of the writing produced. The teaching here is incidental, as with Reading. Probably any method which includes in its aim the Direct Values of beauty, simplicity, and individuality, will achieve also the narrower aim of legibility far more surely and rapidly than a system which only aims at the last.

The general force of modern theories of the Writing lesson, then, centres on very simple Humanist principles: the enhanced value of every

subject that is taught in vital relation with others and for a Direct Value; and the economy of time secured by the same means.

On these grounds the Writing lesson of the Elementary School commonly incurs criticism. The time-expenditure is excessive; the relation with any other subject or any practical need is obscured or ignored; the Handwriting produced achieves only legibility, and achieves it at the price of ugliness and dead uniformity. A teacher was recently heard condemning the writing of one child on the sole ground that it could be distinguished from that of the others. Then, with perfect loyalty to the ideal of uniformity, she put the class through a pen-drill—right elbows rigidly forced into the sides, right shoulders hunched upwards as a consequence, the whole position painful and distorted. The chief fear, deliberately expressed, and not by this teacher only, was of any emergence of individuality in handwriting.

But we maintain that, even in its isolated capacity as a manual dexterity, Writing may and must include in its aim the Direct Values of beauty, simplicity, and individuality. And beyond this, the Writing lesson, as much as the Reading lesson, may be turned to rich account as Literature. From the lowest Standards upwards there is no need for anything less than the best to be copied—"the best" including for Humanism all that is most relevant as well as all that is most exalted, and excluding all meaningless platitudes as well as all irreverent degradation of interest by trivialities. If this were realised, the time expended on "writing" would be no cause of regret, since the

Indirect Value, the mere mechanical facility, would be the least part of the gain. Surely in the Seventh Standard, at least, the "Writing" lesson might surrender itself, and its name, to the Direct Values. There, with few exceptions, the ideal of uniformity and legibility has been achieved with lamentable completeness. Those exceptions are few enough to be dealt with separately, by some such plan as was successfully used in a large High School, the bad writers of all upper classes being detained once a week for special teaching until a satisfactory standard was reached. But for the great majority in the highest Standards, who admittedly do not need further practice in legibility, would it not be more practical and more Humanist to dispense with the Writing lesson as such, and require instead, each week, a few lines of poetry or prose, chosen by the individual, and written in his own book of extracts, with some genuine attempt to honour beauty of words by beauty of handwriting?

ARITHMETIC

We come to the subject which looms largest in time-expenditure and in the importance generally attached to it throughout the Elementary Schools. We have to test its claim to this position in the light of Humanist theory. And we shall base our judgments not so much on the traditional treatment of the subject as on its most progressive developments.

The tendency of recent change is twofold. It is towards the practical and away from the abstract. It is also towards the rational and away from the mechanical. Neither tendency will meet with much opposition to-day.¹ It is their combination into a single tendency that is noteworthy, and for our purpose most hopefully significant. For this union of two purposes commonly supposed to be antagonistic—the practical and the speculative—is the quintessence of Humanism. Neither an Arithmetic which concerned itself solely with daily transactions of expenditure, with insurance, bills, wages, commissions, with the papering of walls and the price of foodstuffs, nor an Arithmetic which concerned itself solely with mental gymnastic could be wholly Humanist. Humanism requires both qualities, the practical and the rational, and the Board of Education is now repeating the demand in its own terms. Asserting that the main difference between the latest "Suggestions" and the earlier is an increased

¹ Though Dr. Stanley Hall has entered a protest against the ultra-rationalising tendency in Arithmetic teaching.

emphasis on the practical aspects of the subject, the most recent circular on Arithmetic¹ at once continues: "It is not to be supposed, however, that the practical side of the subject is to be developed at the expense of the 'disciplinary.' There is no opposition between the two; indeed, if the practical and utilitarian aspects of Arithmetic are constantly kept in view, it will be a much more effective instrument for developing and disciplining the general intelligence of the Scholars than if it is taught in an abstract and unpractical way."

How do these two tendencies manifest themselves in the teaching of Arithmetic to-day? The effect of the first, the practical or utilitarian (it might also be called the Vocational), is seen in the increased use of apparatus—from kindergarten sticks and Tillich's bricks and cardboard money to compasses, protractors, set-squares, T-squares, cubes, cones and cylinders. It is seen in the corresponding decrease, especially in lower classes, of written work. In the syllabus it is marked by the inclusion of mensuration, graphs, and the beginnings of practical surveying; and by the exclusion not only of long and laborious practice of rules already grasped, but often of entire "rules" (such as stocks or true discount) which are never likely to be required for practical use. Again, this tendency will show itself in a greater discrimination of teaching according to the character and needs of the class, and the industrial conditions of the neighbourhood. For girls, the relative neglect of unserviceable rules must be a much more comprehensive principle than for boys, while corresponding emphasis must

¹ Circular 807, "Suggestions."

be laid for them on Domestic Arithmetic, either in the ordinary lesson or in the Domestic Course. Also the total time-expenditure that is justified must surely be much less for girls than for boys, whose future trades will often call for more than the most which the School can achieve. But this adequate discrimination of needs has not yet been reached.

Side by side with the practical tendency, which would seem to justify methods in proportion to their speed and serviceableness, is the increased regard for intelligence and resource. This limits the use of short cuts, or at least postpones it till the full process has been gripped by reason. It also frequently asks for additional labour in testing an answer either by a rough mental calculation or by a second method, thereby avoiding those wildly fantastic results with which the old, mechanical teaching occasionally relieved its dreariness. Fewer children to-day will occupy four sheets of foolscap in deciding that the number of stamps required to cover the wall of a room is $1\cdot372$.¹ Again, the rationalising tendency leads to freedom and variety of method, especially in the arranging of a sum. "Any method," says the Board's Circular, "is provisionally good so long as the arrangement and accompanying wording clearly express, in the child's own way, the meaning of the operations involved." Thus uniformity is discredited, even in the subject where the teacher of a class of sixty may most reasonably plead for it on the ground of economising both time in teaching and labour

¹ The illustration, as well as a later one, is borrowed from Mr. Roscoe, late Principal of the Training College, Birmingham University.

in correcting. But it is inevitable that this Humanist and reforming tendency must be thwarted so long as huge classes make uniform method the only practicable method. On the other hand, the "practical" tendency is hindered by the same cause, through the difficulty of providing sixty children with sufficient concrete material.

Humanism, then, requires a full and free development of just these two modern tendencies. It justifies Arithmetic so far as it is at once practical and disciplinary, and it refuses to accept either condition singly. The mental gymnastic which revels in millions and millionths, though real life may never encounter them, or makes expert in stocks and shares those whose daily transactions are restricted to the corner shop, the pawnbroker or the Penny Bank, is not Humanist. Besides this, for mental gymnastic Arithmetic has rivals, such as Grammar, which Matthew Arnold so strongly upheld in the Elementary Schools. On this ground alone, then, its claim cannot be unshaken. More than this, it can be urged that the shrewd, calculating type of mind thus engendered is a bad type, and that the predominance of the Arithmetic lesson throughout the Elementary Schools is actually promoting it, and arresting the development of a nobler national character. Against this risk, if it exists, all safeguards should be welcome. It is obvious that the "calculating type of mind" may be turned to altruistic purposes as much as to their opposite. And the After-Care Helper might well appeal for increased teaching on the relative money-value—over a term of years—of a well-paid blind-alley job and an apprenticeship. The calculating faculty is

by common consent absent when this familiar problem has to be faced on leaving school. Or again, until family budgets are recognised as honourable and important documents, as well as highly interesting, there is need of all the help that the "practical" Arithmetic lesson can give. But this need not hinder some insight into national expenditure—into the relative cost of, say, a school and a Dreadnought, a library and a hospital, a workhouse and a Leonardo. This wider range is needful for the future citizens of a democracy.

We accept, then, for modernised Arithmetic, Mr. Barnett's claim¹ for the Mathematical and Physical sciences in general, that "they are quite indispensable not only as gymnastics, but also for their definite and applied results." Such a verdict, of course, takes for granted the discarding of the ancient mechanical treatment, of which the unrighteous "borrowing" trick in Subtraction is the favourite example, together with all such juggling as was recently heard in a lesson on decimals: "We have a box of noughts: we can take as many as we like." On the modern basis, the mechanical method is doomed.

But, even as modernised, and as serving the double aim, vocational and disciplinary, is Arithmetic entitled to its present position of supremacy on the Time Table? It is the subject which has far the greatest amount of time allotted to it, often one-sixth of the whole, sometimes one-fifth (five and a half hours a week). The actual hours devoted to it in the Senior School (seven years) are 1344 in one typical school, 1323 in another. In London

¹ *Common Sense in Education*, p. 221.

County Council Schools the amount is somewhat less—for instance, 1176 or 1029 hours. Comparing it with Needlework, which must have a far stronger vocational claim in a Girls' School, it has, often, about four hours and three-quarters weekly, while Needlework has two and a half or three. And girls clad in the same unmended and ragged garments have been seen day after day sitting for long hours over the Rule of Three, or wrestling with decimals in the seventh place. (This last is expressly contrary to the Code.) On the other hand, many Girls' Schools are moving towards a better discrimination of values, and laying more stress on Domestic Arithmetic. One school assigns only two and three-quarter hours to Arithmetic in the Seventh Standard for Girls. But even this seems disproportionate to the need.

Is it not possible to condense the needful work in Arithmetic, while still safeguarding the double aim? Certainly the quickening of interest, which the modernising Schools undoubtedly secure, should mean economy of time. And to some extent the increased use of concrete material assists here. On the other hand, the craze for the concrete has been seriously held responsible for a lowering of the standard of Arithmetic, since the constant repetition of the whole paraphernalia of sticks, cubes, coins, etc., needlessly delays progress when once the reasoning of the rule has been mastered. The concrete material, having done its work, may well be discarded, and replaced by other devices. One master made use of a conveniently red-headed boy, who shifted his position as a decimal point in a row of scholars, and greatly assisted the pro-

gress of the class. There remains, too, an endless resource in the magic of numbers themselves, too often neglected. One teacher has made the multiplication table completely fascinating to many a class by the magic repetition of the figures in the units column in cycles of five.

Our conclusion must be that neither the requirements of the Board, nor those of the children, nor the results achieved¹ justify the 1300 hours, or more, expended on Arithmetic in the seven years of the Senior School.

¹ The judgment passed by the Chief Assistant Mistress and Mathematical Specialist of a Secondary School on the work of Elementary Scholars admitted by scholarships to the school is as follows: "The time spent is far out of proportion to the amount done. It is *amazing* how little they really know when they come to us, in spite of it."

B. THE DIRECT VALUES

ENGLISH

Time Tables of London Elementary Schools compare favourably with many provincial ones in their more generous recognition of the claims of English. Roughly, they give to the whole English group double the amount of time allotted to Arithmetic. In the provinces, however, on one typical Time Table, "English," excluding Reading, but including Composition, Grammar, Writing, Recitation, Spelling, Dictation and Transcription, receives a total of 1477 hours in seven years, as compared with 1344 hours of Arithmetic. A comparison of the Time Tables of Upper Standards in various Girls' Schools gives the same result—roughly, in each week, an equal balance between Arithmetic and the whole of the English group. The Head Master of a large and progressive Mixed School builds up his Time Table for the four highest Standards on a basis of five and a half hours' English (including Reading) and five and a half hours' Arithmetic.

It can be said at once, and with added emphasis in the case of Girls' Schools, that this basis is not Humanist. It satisfies neither the test of practical utility nor the test of expanded sympathies and interests. But within this general statement there is room for the recognition of immense diversity in the actual practice of schools in the teaching of English. Some, concentrating even in this branch of work on the false aim of mechanical proficiency,

lay stress on all the formal elements—on grammar, dictation, and memorising, while even Compositions are forced into an arid uniformity of thought and of expression. One Head Master tells that as an Assistant he was compelled to teach by rote a list of opening phrases for Compositions. And even in the last few months Compositions written on "Autumn," "Our City," and "Our School" were in their dead conventionality more alien to the Humanist purpose than even the extravagant hours devoted to the Method of Equal Ratios. The result in this school was seen in Standard VII, where an attempt to encourage free individual expression, in an essay on the Cinematograph, produced a frank avowal of pleasure in a vulgar "comic," selected as the favourite of all the films seen, and considered worthy of a detailed description in the one hour of original work in English through the week. Both types of Composition were the products of the same system, and witnessed to the same signal failure—the failure to train appreciation. Can we not preserve for ourselves and our scholars something of the dignity with which Mulcaster invests not only Literature and Composition, but the "Indirect Values" of Reading and Writing? "By *reading* we receive what antiquity has left us; by *writing* we hand on what posterity craves of us; by both we get great advantage in all the circumstances of our daily life."

But where the Humanist purpose exists and persists, in spite of insufficient time, English is its best representative on the curriculum as it now stands. The attempt to condense into a paragraph the justice, the magnificence, the comprehensive-

ness and the supremacy of its claim is bound to fail. Yet it must be made, seeing that our existing "public" education in both grades turns to a mockery what might else be thought a truism, that "the chief basis of a liberal education is a knowledge of and familiarity with great books."¹ For all schools alike Mr. Barnett maintains this claim, basing it on broad general grounds—the intrinsic worth of Literature, its comprehension and correlation of all other subjects within itself, its use for historical guidance, for the evoking of patriotism, for the awakening of those right interests which are the highest moral security, for timely preparation for the "merciless experience" of later contact with the actual world, for training of taste and appreciation not only in letters, but in all life. Are not these things the services rendered by great books? Are they not too obvious to call for discussion? Are they not the sum and substance of Humanism?

But here shall be added the special and intensified importance for the Elementary School of a subject with such claims as these. Children in better circumstances may meet with greatness and beauty in many places and in many forms, and may find for themselves a training in values and appreciation even when the school fails to give it. The Elementary scholar, if he does not meet with greatness and beauty in books and at school, may never meet with them, or meet with them so rarely that he fails to recognise them.² Thus for him the

¹ Barnett, *Common Sense in Education*, p. 169.

² This statement will only be considered fantastic by those who lack intimate first-hand knowledge of a very poor area.

Literature lesson is of perfectly critical importance. Its waste or perversion is irreparable. - Its subordination to Arithmetic is unintelligible.

We come to various questions dealing with the practical manipulation of the subject. What shall English include for the Elementary School? What authors shall be read? Are they to be few or many? Are whole works to be read, or extracts? Are they to be chosen for excellence of style or for excellence of matter? What place have Grammar, Paraphrasing, and Dictation in the English scheme?

In regard to all these things it seems possible to detect certain clear leadings of the modern Humanism, though not in all cases a formal decision, since Humanism leaves much to the individual teacher's free disposing.

The first clear leading is that it is Literature itself, and not its accessories, which must occupy the all-insufficient time allotted. The thing to be presented is the prose and the poetry of first-rank authors; and here, since "our chief embarrassment is the embarrassment of excessive wealth,"¹ notes and introductions are to be minimised, and the entry is to be straight and swift to the mind and the heart of the writer.

The choice between whole books or selections, few authors or many, cannot be arbitrarily determined for all alike. That plan will work best which is worked in faith and consistency. We can, however, combine against the old staple diet of poverty-stricken Readers, supplemented perhaps by a single classic laboriously dragged out through

¹ Barnett, *Common Sense in Education*.

a year. Further, bearing in mind the profusion of bad or worthless Literature which sets up its rival claim of indolent or vicious sensationalism, we should perhaps urge on the Elementary School the need of extending, rather than concentrating, the range of right interest—the wisdom of promoting a love of all healthy and pleasant reading, and of providing a generous library of fiction well within the children's grasp. If this is done, the actual classwork may properly be devoted to what is a little beyond that grasp, unaided; and in class the rule of "nothing less than the best" may be absolute. But the free enjoyment of good stories, poems, and biographies, and familiarity with a sufficient number to provide a fair standard of what is worth reading—this, in face of present conditions, is for the Elementary Scholar even more vitally important than the enforced knowledge of a few classics. Free Libraries now make this claim a perfectly reasonable one for town Schools. But the Schools, partly through overpressure of other claims, are availing themselves of perhaps one-tenth of the service which the Libraries might render. In some cases School or Class Libraries are active and adequate, one School Library containing, for example, a thousand books; but for the most part they are very small; and in any case, since the Free Library must be the chief resource when school life is done, it is most desirable to win for it the goodwill of the children, as for a familiar friend, before they leave.

A single sentence—Roger Ascham's—is the answer, so far as there is one, to the question of style and subject-matter: "We find always wisdom

and eloquence, good matter and good utterance, never or seldom asunder." And with this plain guide to practice, seeing that depths of metaphysical inquiry underlie the problem, the teacher may be content.

Of actual schemes for reading, in and out of school, the significant points of resemblance among the best are the emphasis on poetry throughout, on myth, saga and fairy tale at the first stage, on biography and historical narrative at the second, on one or two of the greatest modern poets at the last. But it need not be repeated, at this point, that the first excellence of any scheme must be its individuality and freedom.

What are the accessories of the Literature lesson? None that can touch it in importance, but several that may contribute to its value. And the modern Humanist is rightly laying stress on Composition, as creative activity. It is, on the simplest view, the natural development of the free picture-drawing in crayons of the Infant School. And the protest against the old conventional type of composition—the precise re-telling of what has been told or read, or the rigid treatment of such well-worn themes as Avarice, or April, or Alfred the Great—is taking a double form. It is either a tendency to realism, preferring as themes the intimately familiar—the old boot, which must not only be yours, but yourself, and deliver its plaintive or sordid autobiography through your pen; or it is a tendency to the purely imaginative, the completing of a half-told tale, the interpolation of a conversation in a Dickens novel, or even the making of a poem. It is a disappointing but necessary admission that

even these lively modern themes can be very rapidly reduced to the ancient mechanical level. Recently a class of children, told to "imagine yourself to be a daffodil," were found writing with melancholy uniformity and singular lack of conviction, "I am a daffodil." The old boot would, perhaps, make a better stand against convention. But nothing is safe in the hands of a teacher who is intent not on Humanism, but merely on being up to date.

Paraphrasing and Dictation, both being necessary as tools only, and both being dangerous to our main purpose if used to excess, must be kept within the smallest possible time-allowance. Both of them may assist right appreciation, by presenting a noble thought in noble words, but both of them proceed to commit sacrilege upon it. For this reason, Transcription is a better thing than Dictation, and learning by heart than Paraphrasing. In our modernist demand for mental activity—the demand which Paraphrasing might be expected to meet, though it does not always do so—we are probably underrating that other powerful educational instrument, absorption. But it is this which works mightily through the repeating and copying of great words.

Grammar ceases to vex just so soon as Literature wins its rightful place of supremacy. Then Grammar falls into line as a cheerful—even a merry—subordinate, giving just those practical helps for which the Literature lesson or the Composition asks, and affording a lively and stimulating interest in the manœuvres of words. One weekly lesson for two, or possibly three, years

should be its highest demand on the time of the Elementary School; and none of that time need go, for instance, to the condemning (surely unjust) of the "Introductory It," or of the use of the superlative in comparing two things. Yet these are actual examples of many topics laboriously dealt with, and at tedious length, in Grammar lessons heard by the writer. It would be well if all Schools would adopt the two time-economies practised by one recently visited—first, a fixed terminology, fixed definitions, of an excellent terseness and truth and simplicity, and a uniform scheme of analysis throughout the school; secondly, a clear injunction that "mere curiosities in grammar have no place in the syllabus."

We reach our usual conclusion. The modern ban is aimed just where Humanism would aim it—on meaningless technicalities and on premature definitions, on mechanical paraphrasing, on dissection of dead words that should be living, on all lumber that blocks the way to the reality of books. The new spirit of life and reality is ready to invade the whole domain of English. But the curriculum must make room for so great a thing.

HISTORY

History in the Elementary Schools receives ordinarily about one hour a week. It occupies perhaps one-fifth of the time devoted to Arithmetic; it sometimes does not appear in the lower Standards at all. What are the grounds for its inclusion?

That it widens the intellectual and moral horizon; that by extending the range of sympathy, interest and imagination it cures vulgarity, the essence of which is narrowness of vision; that it teaches things "memorable and significant," "facts that matter"; that it teaches also patriotism and civic duty—these are its claims as summed up by Mr. Barnett,¹ and as no doubt conceived by most teachers of the subject. If they are valid, what needs justifying is, not its inclusion in the curriculum, but the insufficiency of the time allotted to it. Two hours a week would seem the very least amount that might be accepted—one for reading, and one for instruction or for written work, if History is indeed to be turned to those broad Humanist ends described above. And it is surely agreed that it does surpass all other subjects except Literature in serving those ends, by the general expansion of human interest and the definite enrichment of mind and character by significant knowledge.

Is this enrichment and expansion the proper privilege of secondary education only? Is it not rather the peculiar need and the peculiar right of those who suffer most from want of horizon, and

¹ *Common Sense in Education*, Chap. X.

who are most in danger of that intellectual and moral vulgarity which results?

Given a weekly allowance of two hours, or nearly six hundred hours in the Senior School, what principles and what methods of work would Humanism suggest?

In the first place, a larger share of independent reading, which is at present habitually overbalanced by the amount of actual instruction. This reading need never be desultory, however free, but should always be guided by a definite line of thought or a special question to be prepared. It is true that most of the older Readers are inadequate for this purpose, and a genuine use of Libraries must be presupposed. But many of the modern Readers, such as the popular *Highroads of History*, or, still better, such books as the *Piers Plowman Histories* or C. L. Thompson's *First History of England*, at least form a right basis for this supplementary reading. It must be added that the teacher can often claim for History not only its own periods, but the Reading lesson, especially where the class is taught in sections, two-thirds reading silently while the lesson is devoted to the remainder.

The silent reading hour, raised by the teacher and the class to its proper place of privilege, responsibility and delight, is the best possible preparation for the actual lesson. It is also the right complement, and corrective if need be, of the modern practice of dramatisation. This, apart from its special use in the History lesson, is finding favour increasingly on broad educational grounds, as satisfying the demand for more expression. It is easily carried to excess by enthusiasts, and

always exposed to a double danger—the belittling of great themes by a paltry presentation, or misrepresentation, of them; and, on the other hand, the over stressing of picturesque incidents of little significance. Also there is a risk that the teacher who devotes much time and energy to the dramatic efforts or the voluntary wider reading of a few may be overlooking, in other sections of a large class, depths of ignorance which the old-fashioned devotion to Readers and to memorising of facts did at least tend to prevent. Nevertheless, until the Humanist principles of activity, interest and free expression are at home in our schools we shall do well to encourage dramatisation, and not to quarrel even with an exaggerated use of it. In one school which gives it a regular weekly period the dangers already noted are not wholly absent, but the general effect on the quality and spirit of the work in all subjects is undoubtedly to raise it to a higher level. It is probable that for young children the need of expression is even better met by Historical Handwork.

The modernised teaching of History, demanding a just appreciation of “things that matter,” can only achieve its end by the principle of selection. It must, and it does, discard the encyclopædic ideal. For the devotee, the principle of selection is always a hard one, until he reach the haven of the great discovery—that by a right selection nothing is lost, and that the worth of those things which he discards reappears in those things which he retains. On the other hand, if he clings to the encyclopædic ideal, how often are the brightest jewels of his subject buried in wood, hay and stubble! There-

fore, within the broad setting of World-History, selection must be applied to British and Foreign History alike, guided always by the *significance* of things, and never by their bulk. Over much of the discarding thus involved, even the devotee need shed no tears. By common consent of modernists, the Elementary syllabus may rid itself of the details of remote wars, of court intrigues, of royal pedigrees, of much Constitutional History. A broad outline of English History, repeated twice at least during school life, is a reasonable demand; but equal care for all periods is unreasonable; and there still seems to be an underrating of the intense human worth of the fourteenth century, the Elizabethan period, and the struggle between Parliament and the Stuarts. It is significant that these periods are peculiarly rich in material for dramatisation. The Peasants' Revolt,¹ the Armada, and the doings of the Long Parliament seem almost to demand this method of treatment.

But if English History demands the principle of selection in justice to its own great characters and its own great episodes, it demands it also for the sake of its relation to Foreign History. The sentiment "What should they know of England who only England know?" is almost trite among us already; but though we may have learnt to "think imperially" (with sore risk of Jingoism in the process), neither the nation nor its schools have begun to think internationally. This result might be hastened if the permissive wording of the Code—History "need not be limited to English or

¹ Compare its treatment in the dramatic fiction of *Long Will*, by Florence Converse. Everyman's Library.

British History"—were changed into a definite requirement for a syllabus which includes at least one great period of ancient and one of modern Foreign History. Within these broad limits, the choice of special periods is best left as much as possible to the individual teacher. It is enthusiasm, not empty, but based on rich acquaintance with the period, that is the first condition of success. And History is perhaps the subject in which the specialist is most desirable, and for the sake of which a system of partial specialisation is being adopted in some Elementary Schools, and might well be attempted in more.

Among the purposes of the History lesson was included, at the outset, the teaching of patriotism and civic duty. The following chapter will seek to show that this purpose is such an integral part of Humanism that it should be the central motive not of one subject only, but of all. The History lesson cannot do otherwise than surrender itself most heartily to this general purpose; and it is true that it is so specially adapted for it that a separate Civics lesson might be deemed unnecessary. But if so, our two hours minimum must be raised at least to three. The Civic training requires a more detailed and first-hand knowledge of local and current events than is consistent with the principles of such an historical course as we have been considering. The History and the Civics lesson should, however, co-operate, and work with co-ordinated schemes towards the same central end.

GEOGRAPHY

Accepting Kappa's picturesque division of the scholar's universe into "the Adventures of Sinbad" and "Aladdin's Palace,"¹ we pass from the first to the second—from the literary subjects to the scientific, which normally include, for the Elementary School, Geography, Nature Study, Elementary Science, Manual Work and Domestic Subjects. The general purpose of this varied group is one and the same—to make the scholar at home in the physical universe, whether it be with his own body, or the kitchen, or the meadow, or the stars. And most surely Humanism embraces this aim, even if it holds it second to the aim of the "Humanities" proper, which seek to make the scholar at home among men. Nor can Humanism consent to reckon them as alternatives. The two kingdoms are knit in too close an alliance for that.

To the things which the reviving spirit of Humanism has already set under a ban, Geography contributes not a few, such as "lists of place-names, rivers, communications, and so on," presented "as catalogues to be learned without being understood,"² the premature memorising of definitions, the copying of maps, and the close adherence to Readers. These things are the now familiar symptoms of the one deadly educational malady—mechanism. And the reform of Geography teach-

¹ Kappa, *Let Youth but Know*.

² Report of Conference of Educational Associations, 1914, p. 31.

ing, so recent, so rapid and so drastic in its attack on mechanism, is the best possible augury for Humanism.

On the positive side, the principles of the reformed teaching (dating their entry into Elementary Schools from the 1905 "Regulations") centre on the Humanist ideals of rational coherence and free activity. Briefly, these principles are—

I. The double relation of Geography to History and to Physical Science, so that it is the perfect medium of communication between the two groups of studies; and, within its own domain, the coherence of facts, the universal working of the law of Cause and Effect (hence the supplanting of the older geography by the "regional").

II. Active methods of research and practical application, in place of ready-made doles of information; the making of maps according to need; the making of models; the keeping of first-hand records of climatic conditions; the personal investigation of the movements of land and water; the close acquaintance with local geography, and its use as a means of realising, by comparison and contrast, the character of the unseen regions of the earth.

These things are now the commonplaces of any modern approved scheme of school geography. But, in accordance with the Humanist demand for adaptability, there can be no single model syllabus applicable to all schools. This is true of all subjects, but more true of Geography, since the actual geographical environment of the school must in every case help to determine the scheme. Birmingham, Glasgow, Portsmouth, a country village, must each reflect in the Geography syllabus of their

schools the differences which exist in their physical surroundings. A further need of adaptability is pointed out by the Board, due to the present wide divergence in teaching capacity. A Geography scheme which the expert, equipped with recent training, may safely handle, would be as yet chimerical for the rank and file.

A further characteristic of the modern method is its skilful balance of general and special teaching, of world-geography and the study of a limited area in detail. The modern syllabus, advancing up the school, demands more of both—a wider reach and a closer grip. Trained reason and imagination are to give the former; observation and experiment the latter. The home-made map of the classroom is to lead up to the illustrated description of, for example, an imaginary "large island in the North Atlantic, half-way between the British Isles and Newfoundland."¹ Relatively detailed knowledge of England, the British Isles, and the British Empire is always to be at the service of world-knowledge. And specialisation in one *aspect* of geography—the historical, the physical, the commercial—must not be at the expense of the general training.

These general and generally approved principles have directed the Geography scheme which the Board of Education incorporates in its Suggestions. It recognises three stages of school life, ending roughly at nine, twelve, and fourteen years, and requiring a difference, not in the area studied, but in the method of presentation. The youngest children learn best by descriptive narratives (*read*,

¹ Quoted from "Suggestions for the Teaching of Geography," Board of Education Circular 834.

rather than spoken, is the Board's recommendation), together with observation, practical work, and use of maps. The second stage must supplement "what" and "how" by "why." Description must call for reasons, and with fuller knowledge of fact must come fuller use of comparison and contrast—no fact being learnt in isolation. The travels of the great discoverers may be re-enacted and their problems faced anew, giving full scope to the "active" principle. Then, for those scholars who can reach it, a third stage should admit of much more independent work, still prolonging world-study, but concentrating on particular areas and perhaps a particular aspect. The practical work here is more advanced, and problems have a more important place.

The scheme is weighty and comprehensive, and suggests an exacting demand on the Time Table. But, in fact, it asks only for one hour or one and a half weekly. It is to be remembered that Science, Drawing, Nature Study and History should all be co-operating towards the desired result.

As regards apparatus, it might be urged that the best Geography teaching requires the least, since it will make the fullest use of Nature in her daily doings. Beyond this the indispensables are good atlases, wall maps, globes, and books of travel, supplemented by pictures, lantern lectures, and the material for map- and model-making.

NATURE STUDY, SCIENCE, AND DOMESTIC
SUBJECTS

Nature Study is sometimes valued simply as a training in observation and a field of information. These are the least of its privileges. We do not present for the child's enthusiastic study a decaying cabbage leaf or an unlovely fungus. Yet these, for purposes of observation, are as significant as a dewdrop or a snowdrop. We have, in fact, recognised that for our schools, at least, the Humanist value transcends the purely scientific, even in the scientific group of studies. We have rejected, or postponed, the pure knowledge-ideal of the specialist in science, and have included even here the training of appreciation. We affirm that, for children, observation without appreciation is void of value, and that only on such an early training in appreciation, and in the Humanist interest in nature as Aladdin's palace, can the later devotion of the specialist to scientific fact be rightly established.

The recent development of the curriculum seems wholly beneficial here. Nature Study as prescribed by the Code, where it is related to the Observation lesson and the Geography lesson, is the Geography of babes, concentrated on the immediate locality. In some schools it is connected rather with the Science lessons, proceeding from the study of Plant Life in the lowest Standards to a broad course of Physics and Physical Geography. On the other hand "Science" for many girls' schools is mainly

occupied with practical domestic matters and hygiene. One Science Syllabus, for instance, recently issued by a Local Education Authority, lays down as principal topics "The Body in Health" and "the Body in Disease." The character and value of the Science Teaching on these lines, and of the allied work in Domestic Subjects, has been already discussed in Chapter IV. At present the chief difficulty in many schools seems to be to find time for a sufficiently comprehensive scheme of Domestic teaching, and to ensure that every girl is included in the course before she leaves. The danger is that just those girls who are most handicapped on the intellectual side, and so fail to reach the top Standards, may thereby miss also the full training in Domestic Subjects.

As to actual schemes in working, there is at present all the wholesome variety which a new experiment invites, and many points of organisation remain still undecided; whether, for example, the Domestic course is best condensed into a period of several weeks, during which the whole of the School time is given to it, the girls coming in relays through the year; or whether a weekly lesson through one, two or three years is preferable. Both plans are proved satisfactory in practice. The most general criticism of the course at present is that it is often too artificial. Cookery lessons, for instance, in which elaborate dishes are prepared with the aid of perfect appliances, may be too far removed from the possibilities afforded at home to be of much real service. A motherless girl of fourteen, who has just taken over the family house-keeping, professed herself able to cook anything

("except honions—I burns 'em always"); but she said that for the most part she had not learnt these things at school. "We mostly made toffee." Again, Housewifery is often learnt in a model room or cottage, where day by day the most superfluous cleaning and polishing is carried out, and the essence of the problem—viz. dirt—is conspicuously and beautifully absent. But these criticisms, so easy and so obvious, do not yet provide a feasible alternative, and need not, in the meantime, detract from the immense value of the training, even if this consisted merely in the constant presentation of a high standard of everyday home life.

NEEDLEWORK

Recent developments here are of peculiar interest and worth for Humanism. There is increased concern both for the practical and for the educational. It is no chaotic experimenting that is being carried on, despite the variety of practice. The worn, patched garment, and the original embroidery design are equally Humanist materials for the lesson, and equally superior to the old-time specimens. This last is less and less in favour, and only justified if it proves a time-saving method and makes possible a greater output of practical and educational work. Within the last few years the rapid circulation of the principles of *Educational Needlecraft*,¹ and its adoption in many schools, is clear proof of an extending Humanism. The thing that is actually needed, and the thing that gives free play to individual creative activity—these are rightly in demand. The specimen answers to neither description. *Educational Needlecraft* demands that every stitch and every thread shall directly conform to the double ideal of use and beauty, and that these two standards shall never be divorced.

School practice often lags behind the theory, simply through the size of the classes and the impossibility of giving the necessary individual teaching. Obviously sixty girls can be more easily taught to seam or button-hole on specimens (all the worst failures being conveniently thrown away)

¹ See Swanson and Macbeth's *Educational Needlecraft*.

than to mend sixty different kinds of rent, or to cut out and make up new material with risk of serious waste. In face of such difficulty the actual achievement of most schools is better than anything that could be fairly demanded. But the normal production of one completed garment in the year by every child in the class, though all that is possible under present circumstances, is miserably inadequate to the need, both practical and educational, and is trifling in comparison with the amount which a small class could achieve in the same time. May it not be said, very baldly, that the girls who leave the Elementary Schools ought to be able to clothe themselves, and that, in fact, they are not? The "ought" here rests on the vocational principle. This practical efficiency is what their life-plan needs for its safe accomplishment. Only the small minority will be able to maintain a fair standard of clothing, for themselves first, and then for a growing family, on the plan of bought ready-made garments. For the rest, adequate clothing must depend on skilful and plentiful work done at home. But in actual fact it is only the few who make and mend instead of buying; and, therefore, the buying is largely from dealers, and often itself a downward process, lowering the standard of freshness and fitness still further.¹

In many good Training Colleges the syllabus is striving to meet the need by giving students not only practical efficiency (the schools not having done this), but also sound principles of taste and

¹ There is strong confirmation of this view in the memorandum by the Head Mistress of Haggerston Road School, L.C.C., included in Mr. Blair's 1908 Report.

expenditure in dress. One such syllabus requires from teachers of Standard VI that the patching lessons shall enable the children to "put on anything anywhere," the patching, of course, being always done on actual garments, and no hole ever cut for the purpose. Further, it requires that the teaching shall promote freedom, and the formation of good taste and sound principles of choice in regard to clothes.

But, once more, it is the practical difficulties in the schools that defeat the educational aim. It is not possible to assist each of sixty in the choice of material and the cutting and making of additional garments beyond the required unit. Hence in practice the element of choice hardly makes its appearance, and the most stimulating and helpful features of the lesson are exactly those which hard experience tends to crowd out. It is a significant and somewhat reproachful fact that comparatively few girls are willing to enter the dressmaking trade, preferring not only office work but many forms of rough and unskilled labour.¹ But a further criticism seems more justly aimed at the existing school-practice—that girls are frequently allowed to sit day after day through the school lessons—including the Needlework lesson—in the same unmended rags. So great an absurdity should not be tolerated. In a mixed class of very poor children in Scotland a big girl repeatedly held up an arm from which the sleeve was all torn away, while she answered questions set by the Master in geography, including the list of the

¹ This statement is confirmed by the Secretary of a Juvenile Labour Exchange in a large town.

mountain-ranges of Spain. "Sierra Nevada" was surely not a practical or a Humanist piece of education for this girl. Plainly, also, she needed a woman teacher. But such instances might be multiplied indefinitely, even in classes taught by women.

Against this we may set the good work done in knitting (turned to good account by many schools in the service of the army during the present war), and the rapid progress of such schools as have adopted the principles—not necessarily the precise methods—of *Educational Needlecraft*. Progress indeed seems assured as soon as the lesson is adapted to the creative interest of every child, and to the actual capacity of each. In one peculiarly successful school the children are allowed to take out their own needlework or knitting as soon as the appointed piece of work (in any subject) is fairly finished. As, moreover, the regular needlework lessons here amount to three hours in the week, there is every prospect that the girls will have sufficient skill and sufficient enjoyment in the subject to make of it a most valuable resource for leisure, a practical assistance in economy, and, if necessary, a means of livelihood.

DRAWING AND PAINTING

Writing, Geography, Science, and especially Nature Study, have brought us very near to this subject many times. Drawing might, in fact, claim the place which Mr. Barnett assigns to English, as the ideal correlating subject. Even stronger is its claim to satisfy the modern demand for expression as the main educational principle, and especially for very young children. Hence it is being used in many schools earlier than writing, which is a harder, less pleasant, and less healthy form of expression, and fails, besides, to evoke original or creative response. "Babies," says Mr. Ablett, "develop a means of communication by drawing which serves them better than speech in early years, and is always a splendid auxiliary to it throughout life." Throughout the country, Infant Sunday Schools, "reformed" by various systems, but all in accordance with the same Humanist principles, are making Drawing an integral part of the lesson. And recently it has been specially advocated for the History teaching of very young children, whose original Time Charts are to be filled in not with written statements of events but with coloured illustrations.¹

More general, but equally obvious, is its use for the Geography and Science teaching of older children as well as Infants. But above all it is the perfect complement of Nature Study. A single

¹ Article in *Times Educational Supplement*, November 1914, "Children under Seven."

effort to draw, paint, or model a flower or leaf or fruit will quicken observation more effectually than a whole course of lessons of the "informing" kind, even though these include the seeing and handling of specimens. It is in the attempt to reproduce that the eyes are opened—and often with the suddenness of a so-called miracle.

If this is so, two conclusions must be granted. First, that the value of the Drawing lesson is great for all children alike, regardless of aptitude; secondly, that all the objects drawn must be chosen with serious regard for their intrinsic worth or beauty. For mechanical skill and for practice in mere observation, the all-too-popular clothes-peg may meet the case. For training in appreciation—(and is unappreciative drawing after all a legitimate Humanist aim?)—it is a most melancholy failure. Yet, in the month of September, amid a profusion of red and golden leaves and flaming berries, it was clothes-pegs that were being drawn by at least two classes in one school. Such an intolerable waste of opportunity is certainly not countenanced by the Board's demand, which is for those "methods and materials (especially water-colours and the brush) which are most appropriate to each stage and best adapted to sustain his interest and pleasure in the work."¹ Want of materials, so often pleaded, is not a warranted excuse, in view of this injunction. And, for the supply of natural objects, an ample and inspiring syllabus for a correlated school course is suggested by such volumes as *Nature Study on the Blackboard*,² in which the objects selected are most of them easily available,

¹ Code.

² Pycroft and Kelman.

and all of them rich in beauty and interest. One might reasonably urge that Nature Study should normally provide the subject of the Drawing lesson, except when Geography, History or English have some special claim to raise—for instance, the illustration of a poem—which cannot be met by voluntary work done out of school. If we are to admit the plea that desirable objects are too difficult to obtain at all times from Nature, we would even prefer a relapse to the forbidden flat copies of old days, provided they were beautiful, rather than the devotion of the one Drawing lesson of the week¹ to such an “actual object” as a clothes-peg.

But of course the relapse is wholly unnecessary. Memory Drawing is the right and rich resource of the teacher who lacks good material for direct drawing from the object; and it is in any case to be freely used on its own merits. Especially if subjects for Memory Drawing are carefully chosen, sometimes announced beforehand and studied out of school, and if, further, the memory-exercise be developed into mental imaging, we may admit the full claim made for this branch of the work by Mr. Catterson Smith,² that it develops keener observation, greater concentration, and deeper imagination than the other branches. Memory Drawing alone, as he explains, may not involve this higher power of mental imaging. It may be the mechanical recalling of the details of the object, piecemeal. Of far greater worth is the mental picturing of the

¹ A second lesson, though common in Boys' Schools, is rare for Girls.

² Head Master of the Municipal School of Art, Birmingham. The suggestions following are given in his article in *Art School Notes*.

object as a unity, and its free reproduction according to the individuality of the student. Hence the recommendation of such memory-exercises as compel this fuller development, *e. g.* the combining of the single given object with two, three or more of its kind in a memory-design; and the further recommendation that, when both Memory Drawing and Direct Drawing of the same object are asked for, the memory work shall always be first, not second.

We are of course deliberately setting the chief Humanist aim—the training in observation and free expression—above the secondary utilitarian motive which was originally responsible for the inclusion of Drawing in the curriculum. “Drawing, like Elementary Science, was originally introduced with a view to the improvement of our manufactures,”¹ and it was not until 1901 that it was commonly accepted for Girls’ Departments, where the utilitarian purpose seemed less obvious. Happily, the worth of a thing is independent of its origin. It matters not how or why Drawing came into the Elementary Schools, so long as it is now set free to do its full Humanist service there. Nor need the vocational value suffer. “Skill in the designing studio or the engineer’s drawing office is not lost in the end by the treatment of Drawing at the Elementary School as a liberal art.”² Most significant for Humanism is the recent expression of belief, repeated many times by teachers and experts at a meeting of the Royal Drawing Society, that the purpose of the Drawing lesson was not

¹ Prideaux, *Survey of Elementary English Education*.

² *Ibid.*

academic proficiency, but the making of "better citizens of the world."

A practical corollary may be added, for all who have to do with young children, that the Drawing-craze is never to be suppressed, but only guided. Not in suppression, but in guided expression, lies the hope that one day our walls, palings and hoardings will be safe from defacement by the productions either of child-rebels or of advertisers.

MANUAL WORK

Two obvious causes account for the absence of this branch of training from the Greek scheme of Humanist Education,—the aristocratic ideal which controlled a so-called democracy based on a slave-population, and the high degree of physical efficiency and skill which was provided by the education in Gymnastic, and which seemed a sufficient guarantee of balance as set against the literary training. "Play and physical training, those two basic co-partners with handwork," as in 1914 they are described, seemed to the first Humanists sufficient in themselves, without the third.

But Humanism was bound to break through the artificial and illogical limits imposed by its early political environment. Comenius was more true to the Platonic doctrine than were Plato and Aristotle themselves, when he boldly wrote: "We design, for all who have been born human beings, general instruction to fit them for everything human." He took his stand on the broad educational ground which is held by the great majority of Manual Work teachers to-day, and publicly adopted by the National Association of Manual Work Teachers. Not "vocational training," which is "specialised and technical," but "educational Handwork," which is "broad and liberal," is the accepted purpose.¹ The same was the purpose of Rabelais and Locke,

¹ Report of Conference of Educational Associations, 1914, H. Holman on "Some Dangers concerning Handwork Teaching."

in desiring to include this kind of training. But Luther was moved also by the practical and vocational aim in putting forward his daring innovations, and asking for a system of popular education in which only two hours a day should be spent on ordinary school subjects and in the school buildings, the rest of the working day to be devoted to the learning of a trade at home. In Comenius' scheme the Elementary School gave only four hours' instruction daily, and two of these were devoted to Manual Work and Music.

The full establishment of Manual Work in the schools is clearly marked out as a Twentieth-century achievement, not yet completed, but already sure. "The period since 1900," says Prideaux, "has been marked . . . by a great increase in the attention devoted to practical home-craft and manual training."¹ Many converging lines of thought have been leading irresistibly to such a development of the curriculum; and the needful impetus was given by the founding of the National Association of Manual Training Teachers in 1891. We have said that the vocational aim is subordinate, and this is proved by the adoption of Manual Training in Secondary Schools of every type as well as in Elementary. The awakening of new interest and the evoking of new faculty are the first purposes. "In future," said Sir Philip Magnus in a Presidential address to the Association,² "the main function of education will be to train our hands and our sense-organs and intellectual faculties, so that we may be placed in a position of advantage for seeking knowledge." And his warn-

¹ *Survey of Elementary English Education*,

² 1894.

ing is the typical Humanist warning, applied to the new subject: "Above all things, avoid the slough of routine, the decline and fall into methods of mere drill. It is by constant creation you will succeed."

The present difficulties and disputes in Manual Training turn largely on the excessive application of the last principle—"constant creation," interpreted as the withdrawal of definite and well-graded instruction, in favour of the "go-as-you-please" method which was attacked with much energy at a recent Conference by the Superintendent of Manual Training in Manchester.¹ To check this perversion of a sound principle, and the waste of time and material involved, we may well keep hold at the same time of the vocational aim, which is to be subordinate, but not discarded. It is to be retained, not in its narrowest form—the making of a livelihood by the individual, but in the form which links it to the social purpose of education—the exalting of craftsmanship in the service of the State and the community. Such a view will prevent us from underrating the actual product, and holding the quality of the work done a matter of indifference so long as the worker is "expressing himself." Surely both these views of Manual Work, the vocational and the "educational," are sound and right if comprehended in the true Humanist ideal of social individuality. Guided by that ideal, the manual work of the schools cannot fail to prepare the way for a transformed civic life, when the whole material environment shall be beautified and dignified by the diffused skill and craftsmanship of the citizens.

¹ Report of Conference of Educational Associations, 1914, J. H. Judd, "Is Manual Training Worth While?"

This is admittedly the ideal—the “dream” of Fourier and Zola—which is claimed for the manual work of Elementary Schools by the Director of Education in Liverpool.¹ His recent book, giving a full account, fully illustrated, of the actual Hand Work done in the schools of his own city, goes far to justify the dream; and a reference to the schemes of work there detailed is the best completion of this section.

¹ Legge, *The Thinking Hand*.

MUSIC

Plutarch writes—

“Whoever he be that shall give his mind to the study of music in his youth, if he meet with a musical education proper for the forming and regulating of his inclinations, he will be sure to applaud and embrace that which is noble and generous, and to rebuke and blame the contrary, as well in other things as in what belongs to music. And by that means he will become clear from all reproachful actions, for now having reaped the noblest fruit of music, he may be of great use, not only to himself, but to the commonwealth; while Music teaches him to abstain from everything that is indecent, both in word and deed, and to observe decorum, temperance and regularity.”

Is this truth or fancy or falsehood? If it is truth, we shall hardly be content to count Music as an “extra,” or to omit it from the daily programme of any school, much less to omit it from the whole school life as until very recently the United States have done, and, until Thring’s day, the English Public Schools. As to English Elementary Education, before the Reformation it was the Song School, the Chantry School, that was the prevailing type. Afterwards “Music was crowded out by Arithmetic, as in the Grammar Schools it was crowded out by the Classics.”¹ Since 1900 its place in the Elementary School has been secured again.

¹ Prideaux, *Survey of Elementary English Education*, p. 146.

But what is the Humanist tradition concerning Music? There are few subjects on which it speaks so clearly, and none which the first Humanists rate more highly. We have to realise that, before Reading and Writing were known, and for some time afterwards, Music was the staple subject of instruction in the Greek Schools, even in its strict sense, and that it was counted of such supreme educational worth that it gave its name also to the whole group of literary subjects with which it allied itself. Certainly its Humanist value must have been great, since the proficiency it aimed at was not mechanical skill but "the improvising an accompaniment in harmony with the thought expressed in the passage repeated."¹ "It is to be doubted," Monroe adds, "whether education as a process of developing creative power—power of expression, of initiative and of appreciation—has ever been given a more fruitful form." If it is difficult for us, as a nation, to recover this conception of music, and to understand the extreme gravity with which Plato discussed its educational significance, it is because we have lost not only the Greek ideal but the Humanist tradition. Plato regarded the musical faculty as so susceptible both to training and to passive impression that every metre, every rhythm, every tune employed by poets and musicians was a matter of critical moral importance to the individual scholar, and therefore of such national importance as to require a rigorous censorship.² Melodies and metres which suggest moral enervation, or on the other hand uncontrolled excitement, are to be rejected in favour of those which

¹ Monroe, *History of Education*.

² *Ibid.*, p. 91.

suggest stern simplicity and unemotional courage. And, be it observed, this was no vague, unpractical talk, since both Socrates and his hearers knew perfectly, and mention by name, just those musical "modes" which such a censorship will exclude, and just those which it will accept.

It is largely on this moral ground that most Humanists have attributed importance to music as a school subject, though they are far less explicit than Plato,¹ and more concerned than he with its other claim as a "culture" subject. Vittorino is careful to include it for those pupils who show talent. Express provision is made for it by Elyot, Ascham, Rabelais, Luther, Comenius, Pestalozzi, Fröbel, Thring, whether they claim it for the many or the few. And in Comenius, Pestalozzi, and Thring we recover something of the Platonic earnestness in their advocacy. In the first scheme of universal Elementary education, the Wurtemberg scheme of 1565, the three R's are Reading, Writing and Religion, and their only supplement is sacred music.

In our school practice we seem for many centuries to have travelled very far from the Humanist tradition, and only now to be feeling our way back to it by another path. Recent Psychology, particularly in America, has been laying stress on the emotions as the basis of mental structure; and psychological theory slowly makes its way into educational practice in the Schools. Hence Music, as the discipline and also the liberation of emotion, is likely to win a growing consideration as a school subject. Certainly it is already a chief excellence of very many

¹ *Republic*, III, 398 ff.

Elementary Schools. And when once it has established itself it will reign by its own right. For invariably in the hands of the expert it has proved itself of surpassing value, and the Uppingham experiment is, in all essentials, repeating itself in a thousand schools to-day, secondary and elementary, according to their needs and opportunities. It is the one subject, besides Gymnastics, in which the big class is not a hindrance but an inspiration, and mass-teaching not only possible but right. For the individual, the singing lesson is discipline, physical, mental and moral, and it is also liberation of emotion in its highest form. For the class, it may be the concentrating, into a single half-hour and a single, intense expression, of all the best elements of the school life and the week's activities. And in chorus-singing the Humanist ideal, however mysterious, of an individuality that is social, is most perfectly realised.

Nor can we separate the singing of the school from its national significance. Grundtvig, founder of the People's High School movement, based the happiness of Denmark, as well as its existence, on education, and he based education on music. "By means of these schools," so runs the inscription beneath his portrait, "a liberal education has been brought within the reach of the country labouring folk of Denmark. It is due to his influence that the education of the Folkehojskole is historical and political, appealing to the conscience and stimulating the imagination, humanistic rather than technical. Grundtvig wrote many songs full of the joy of life, and permeated with a fervent, patriotic spirit." There follows his own often quoted

remark: "It will be my greatest happiness, if I can write songs that will make bare legs skip in the street at the sound of them. That shall be my best poem, which is the greatest favourite in the Danish harvest fields."

The practical difficulty is plain enough, but it is not insuperable. It is the reconciliation of the national ideal of music with the educational ideal of music, of widespread knowledge and love of folk-song with sound training in classical composers. Pestalozzi was careful to include both purposes, but to begin with the first; and it would seem most reasonable to adopt this principle in the Elementary Schools. Neither Staff Notation nor Tonic Sol-Fa are necessary for Folk Song; they are a needless delay. The qualified teacher can teach by ear fifty songs in the time which, till recently, was often expended on the minimum of five required. But most certainly the reading of music and the understanding of music are to be taught as well. Supposing one weekly lesson were devoted to this, and mental discipline kept in the forefront of the aim, then, in a second lesson, and if possible in a short daily practice as well, the class might travel swiftly and joyously over the wide lands of folk song, without sacrificing the standard of carefulness and accurate knowledge that the first lesson has established. But if indeed we must choose between them, it is the lesson of the second type, rather than the first, which will bring about the national regeneration of popular music, and will carry its own standard, together with the desire for a better one, beyond the school walls, into the home and the street and the Music Hall. The criticism of Mr.

Clague (District Inspector of London Elementary Schools) is very just, both in its special application to music and in its wider range. "The singing in the schools is doubtless good. . . . But let any one compare the street singing, which one perpetually hears from young persons, or the singing of parties on excursions, with what one may hear in Yorkshire or Wales in similar circumstances, and he will be convinced that the schools cannot hold their own against the music-halls and the pot-houses. It cannot, in fact, be argued with conviction that the school sufficiently prepares for or influences later life."¹

We bring our discussion of curriculum to a close with Singing, and with the suggestion that each day in an Elementary School might well be brought to a close in like manner.

¹ Report of the Education Committee, London County Council, 1908.

SUMMARISED CONCLUSIONS OF CHAPTERS V AND VI

- I Except the three R's, all subjects at present included in the Elementary School curriculum stand on a sure ground of Direct Value. Most of them suffer from want of time. All of them, except Music and Physical Training, suffer from the size of the classes.
- II. In regard to the three R's a double change is needed, and is gradually being effected in many schools : (i) a shortening of the time devoted to them ; and especially of the time for Arithmetic in Girls' Schools. (ii) An improvement of teaching-method and material, so that in these subjects also Direct Values may be added to the indirect.
- III The desired Direct Value is twofold : (i) Vocational in immediate relation to trade or home-life ; (ii) General or Humanist, in immediate relation to worthy human interests, apart from livelihood. These two values are not antagonistic, and are best realised together.
- IV. The Direct Value is secured, not by the subject, but by the treatment of the subject. It is only secured by the teacher who has experienced it for himself. It is best secured by one who, with a sufficient background of general knowledge, has specialised in one or more subjects. A system of partial specialisation seems altogether desirable for our Elementary Schools, though not the excessive use of the principle, which is hindering Humanism in many Secondary Schools.¹

FOR REFERENCE

(CHAPTERS V AND VI)

- BARNETT. *Common Sense in Education*. Longmans.
 BARNETT (EDITOR). *Teaching and Organisation*. Longmans.
 MATTHEW ARNOLD. *Reports on Elementary Schools*. Wyman.
 PRIDEAUX. *Elementary English Education*. Blackie.
 MAGNUS. *Educational Aims and Efforts, 1880-1910*. Longmans.

¹ See also Chap. X.

KERSCHENSTEINER. *The Schools and the Nation*. Macmillan.

DAVENPORT. *Education for Efficiency*. Heath (Boston, U.S.A.).

PRITCHARD AND ASHFORD. *An English Primary School*. Harrap.

BOARD OF EDUCATION. *Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers and others concerned in the Work of Public Elementary Schools*. Revised Edition. Wyman.

BOARD OF EDUCATION. *Code of Regulations for Public Elementary Schools*. Wyman.

BLAIR. *Report of Annual Conference of Educational Associations, 1914, 1915*. Secretary, 74, Gower Street.

BLAIR. *Report of the Education Officer (L.C.C.) for the Year 1908-1909 (including Memoranda on Educational Progress since 1870)*. King.

CHAPTER VII

CHARACTER, INTEREST AND CITIZENSHIP

SUPREMACY OF THE ETHICAL AIM FOR HUMANISM—

Knowledge of Facts to provide material for Appreciation of Values, *i. e.* for Right Interest.

THE ACTUAL MORAL FAILURE—

National Evidence: 1. Concerning Children.
2. Concerning Adults.

CAUSES OF THE FAILURE, SUGGESTING LINES OF ADVANCE—

- i. Development of Habit apart from Interest.
- ii. Want of Direct Moral Instruction, or mis-directed Moral Instruction. Criticism of Moral Lessons.
- iii. Obscuring of the Moral Ideal in general School Life.
- iv. Discipline based on wrong and Extrinsic Interest.

Experiments of George Junior Republic and The Little Commonwealth.

DISCIPLINE THROUGH INTRINSIC INTEREST—

- i. In the Subjects Taught.
- ii. In Self-Government.
- iii. In Citizenship.

Need of Practical Application of Civics.

CHAPTER VII

CHARACTER, INTEREST AND CITIZENSHIP

"A many-sided interest overcomes sin."—HERBART.

THE SUPREMACY OF THE ETHICAL AIM

THE ideal expressed in Vittorino's school, "a sanctuary of manners, deeds and words" is pre-eminently an ethical one. His passion for Latin scholarship is less than his passion for goodness. In this he is at one with the whole company of Humanists, from Plato to our own day. "All men who have written about education, and who are worth reading," says Laurie, "have placed before themselves the ethical outcome of school and its studies as the highest."¹ And, just because of its widespread acceptance in a theory divorced from practice, the sentiment that "the chief end of education is character" has degenerated from truth to truism.

But if it is true that the ethical aim is for Humanism the predominant aim, it is also true that it is never isolated. Health and understanding go with it, condition it largely, complete it always. Therefore the Humanist who first sets up his white banner of virtue is presently constrained to inscribe upon it in letters of gold "Virtue is knowledge."

¹ *Educational Opinion from the Renaissance*, p. 79.

"The stupid man cannot be virtuous," says Herbart; and Arnold in his battle for "moral thoughtfulness" at Rugby relied as much on a Sixth Form lesson in Thucydides as on a sermon.

Probably this Socratic faith is the faith of all who genuinely "believe in education"; certainly it is the faith of those reformers who have fought for its extension to the masses. It was not for the spread of information, for the awakening and satisfying of the intellect that they contended. It was for the uplifting of life, which demands chiefly goodness and health, and facts for the sake of these. But because the facts are the most tangible part of the scheme, it is knowledge of facts that education often stands for in the mind of the multitude, the means being mistaken for the end, and the facts, without any appreciation of value, being held sufficient. This is not the faith of Humanism.

THE ACTUAL MORAL FAILURE

Either the Humanist faith is in error, or our educational practice has betrayed it. For it is on moral grounds that the national education is most justly charged with failure. No one will soberly assert its success who observes "the nation" at a General Election, or on a Mafeking Night, or who has even an outline knowledge of the facts concerning our prisons, hospitals, asylums, work-houses, and all the miserable multitude of last resorts for those who, through their own fault or through the fault of society, have made physical, mental or moral shipwreck. The facts concerning one national characteristic alone—alcoholism—are

sufficient to deny success to our national education. We are to realise that every loafer, every Weary Willie, every drunkard, every brute in human form, has been through our Elementary Schools, and we are to acknowledge, if other arguments do not appeal, that some thirty millions sterling is an over-high price for the product.

Again, we have the evidence of the Children's Courts, *e.g.* the record in Birmingham alone of more than a thousand offences of Juveniles tried in these Courts in one year.¹ This is, of course, plain matter for the teacher's anxious concern. But it is the ordinary courts that give the graver and still more relevant evidence. For a sober view must hold education more responsible for these life-histories of the "educated" than for the actual doings of the children of school age while character-making is still in process. The teacher may justly say "wait and see," in self-defence, when confronted with the occasional outrage of some school termagant. But the converse is also true. And in the case of the most correctly conforming child the teacher must also suspend judgment—must "wait and see," lest the school morality be but an outer garment of convention, a good custom accepted because it is custom and not because it is good. Such garments, we know, are not apt to wear well.

HABIT AND INTEREST

It is for this reason that the present chapter deliberately sets aside what has been until very recently

¹ 1071 for the year 1913 ; 1217 for the year 1912.

the dominant element in elementary education—Habit. Its importance is fully admitted, and on just those grounds laid down by Professor James in an immortal chapter.¹ But only on those grounds. What has in fact occurred is the ascendancy of Habit without its justification, the enlargement of Interest. But the sole value of a conventional morality and a mechanical level of instruction is that they may liberate personality for higher achievement—that, on the basis of self-working, time-and-temper-saving habits of order, punctuality and the like, the will may continually reach out in new self-appointed moral effort; and that, on the basis of tabulated and easily available facts, the mind may continually create its own structure of free-thought and inquiry. The motive power of the creative work which alone has value is, for mind and will alike, not Habit but Interest. But again, what has happened in our Elementary Schools is a vast development of Habit apart from Interest. And with a leaving age of fourteen the permanent result seems to be not any particular good habit, nor a set of good habits, but a thing which is evil, the habit of Habit. It leads to the life of convention, good or bad as chance will have it, and to acquiescence in any standard which chance presents, if only it be the standard of the majority. We ask any one who is acquainted with the actual conditions of work in an average factory, and with the actual home-environment of the boy and girl unskilled worker, whether this is a safe preparation of character which the school is giving—whether

¹ *Text-book of Psychology*. Chap. X, "Habit." Compare Chap. III of this volume.

acquiescence, dull conformity, and habit constitute a moral outfit which is likely to promote a better social and industrial order. But if Interest be made the keystone of education, and if education be prolonged at least through the years of adolescence, which are the golden age of Interest, then we may hope for a permanent result in the formation not of Habits but of Habitues, to use Professor Welton's helpful distinction—the tendency of the mind to enlarge its interests continually with new truth, and of the will to choose for itself, and to choose well. Then only may we accept with hope, and not with terror, the solemn truth of the Interest doctrine, as Nettleship has expressed it: "One imitates the thing one is interested in, and one gradually becomes the thing one imitates."¹

CAUSES OF THE FAILURE AND LINES OF ADVANCE

I. We have already given what seems from overwhelming evidence to be the chief cause of failure. It is the development of Habit apart from Interest.

II. Another alleged, but much disputed cause of failure is the want of direct moral instruction in the schools. The theoretical question is not simple, and the evidence of facts is ambiguous. There are some schools where the "Moral Lesson" counts for much, many where it counts for little, a few where it counts for bad. And there may well be a genuine Humanist belief, that Virtue is knowledge, controlling even such a curriculum as that of our Elementary Schools, which commonly assigns one

¹ Nettleship, *Lectures on the Republic of Plato*, p. 101.

weekly Moral Lesson and six or seven in Arithmetic. The expressed opinion of many Head Teachers is that the Moral Lesson is a very minor part of moral education. And among Secondary and Elementary Teachers the prejudice is very strong against such systematised moral courses as those drawn up by the Moral Education League or by individual Head Teachers. The idea of teaching, under external direction, and at a stated hour, regardless of actual needs, first cleanliness, then courtesy, then the picking up of orange-peel, then respect for the aged, is utterly repugnant to them. And it is not because they undervalue these things, but because they count them too great to be thus pigeon-holed. Their belief that virtue is knowledge means a belief, not in the Moral Lesson as such, but in the whole curriculum. It is the belief that general mental enlightenment must bring with it general moral improvement.

Probably a still greater number would, with the writer, endorse this view if only the facts would endorse it. But instead they make it almost ridiculous. The national moral failure must shake our faith in any existing "indirect" method, whatever it may be. And we are perhaps bound to make fair trial of a fuller direct method, such as that of the Moral Education League,¹ until we can prove it equally inadequate.

The provision made by the weekly Moral Lesson in most Council Schools is on such a small scale—often dwindling to ten or twelve minutes or even five—and, as said just now, held in such slight

¹ See the syllabuses of Moral and Civic Instruction, and other publications of the League ; 6 York Buildings, Adelphi, W.C.

account that it can hardly be called a fair trial of the direct method. As far as it goes, however, the evidence of these lessons is quite simple and clear. Where they are given with conviction and goodwill they are the best and most practical part of the day's work. Where they are given with negligence, formalism, or scepticism, they are a serious hindrance to the main purpose of education. *Corruptio optimi pessima*.

More definitely, four criticisms may be made, drawn from Moral Lessons heard by the writer. First, the teaching is often detached from life, formal and unpractical. A lesson on fasting, for instance, must be painfully irrelevant to boys of Standard VII, in a neighbourhood whose daily practical problem is the scarcity of food. And a lesson on courtesy, drawing all its instances from Royal Families, must be at best formal, if not misleading, to the daughters of artisans. It is perfectly essential that the lesson should have a direct bearing on life, and admit of definite and speedy application. The cry for realism—for things, for action, for experiment—is making itself heard in every subject, it would seem, sooner than in this one. Yet nowhere are words more barren than in a Moral Lesson divorced from practical application. "Instruction in matters of moral import," says Dr. Kerschensteiner, "is ineffective everywhere when it is not combined with practical exercise or custom."¹ And, following his clear lead, we reach at once our second criticism, that the teaching is too often individualist and self-centred instead of social. It is only in the wider fields of civic and

¹ *The Schools and the Nation*, p. 13.

social interest, and not in any individualist scheme of ethics, that a proper sphere of practical application can be found. By a stronger emphasis on the social character of morality the Moral Education League would assuredly win support from many who now, rightly or wrongly, see in it a tendency to promote priggishness. Never will the perfecting of the individual as such be a sufficiently interesting affair, either for a lesson or a life. The path to reality in both lies through the steady expansion of civic and social interest—an interest which does in fact become more absorbing with every right presentation, and still more with every practical application. "The conception of interest," says Professor Dewey, "as naturally a selfish or egoistic principle is wholly irreconcilable with the facts." Very plain to see was the interest of a class (of the poorest type of girls) in a lesson recently given on the Stevenson couplet—

"The world is so full of a number of things,
I'm sure we should all be as happy as kings,"

the "direct instruction," to preserve and to increase the beauty of the world for the sake of its *universal* enjoyment, being reinforced by perfectly practical suggestions. But to this central topic we shall return.

Or, thirdly, the teaching fails because it is on the negative, early Old Testament plane, which, if accepted as final, is bad Christianity and bad Psychology. A lesson on the Lord's Prayer, for instance, was recently heard, which deliberately and carefully identified "Thy will" with the Ten Commandments, to the complete baffling of little

girls of nine. They might have found in the New Testament and the New Commandment a more helpful and plain interpretation.

Lastly, the teaching may fail through being complacently static instead of progressive, the moral and religious ideal suggested being rather the lazy acceptance of a gift than a lifelong effort towards a goal. This is perhaps the special risk of sectarian teaching and the sectarian spirit—whatever the sect—and a very solid explanation of the fact that any needless insistence on sectarianism, and any needless prolongation of it, is invariably retrograde in its moral result. It is safe to say that what prolongs, not sects, but sectarianism, is the jealous guarding of privilege; and that, just so soon as the sects transfer their centre of gravity from privilege to service, they will cease to be sectarian, and will unite through a new and sudden revelation of the brotherhood of work—their differences, so far as they have worth, not being obliterated, but turned to good account in the enriching of the whole Church. Towards this end—desired now by how great a multitude of Christians of every denomination!—the schools, provided and non-provided alike, can make their powerful contribution if they will. They can teach the religion and morality of social service, concentrating not on the doctrines which divide, but on the work which unites. And here truly, religion and morality, each culminating on the master-principle of love, seem to ask of us no careful distinguishing of the one from the other, but rather an ever closer identification. Probably only those most concerned, viz. the teachers, know how utterly unimportant and irrelevant, in actual

practice, is the so-called "religious" controversy to the main purpose of religious and moral instruction.

The "Direct Teaching," then, may fail through being formal, individualist, negative, or static and sectarian. But the Moral Lesson should be none of these things. Its real service should be the gathering up and concentrating of all the best elements of school and home experience into one central purpose which is infinitely worth while, and bestows unique value both on the work as a whole and on the worker.¹ It should be the continually renewed vision of the ideal, interpreting the actual, and redeeming the common hours from commonness, for "the vision of the ideal guards monotony of work from becoming monotony of life."² We are not saying that such a reassertion and reminder ought to be needed, but only that facts prove it to be needed very grievously. Teachers, especially those who are constantly receiving it by their own reading, or by intercourse with high characters, or by religious helps, or by a gracious environment, are perhaps too slow to realise how very few are the actual chances of such a reminder which can come home to the child of an Elementary School, and how deep is the dependence of such a child on his Teacher for his best experience. We may perhaps conclude, without cynicism, that the direct Moral Lesson is an unimportant part of the curriculum in the schools of Utopia, but important and altogether necessary for the schools of our own country to-day. The ideal it sets up is to be a challenge and a call—"My Father worketh hitherto, and I

¹ Compare Mr. Bray's discussion, *The Town Child*, Chap. IV.

² Westcott.

work"—"The labourers are few"—"Son, go work to-day in my vineyard"—a challenge and a call bringing every secular hour into the sacred scheme of life, urgent and practical, new with every new situation, but ready to deal with it; looking always away from self to the world's beauty and the world's need—to the fields "white unto harvest," issuing no single prohibition, but only the perfect law of liberty, and the endless invitation of the love of God renewed with every childish victory or defeat, "Friend, come up higher."

III. It follows, if such be the teaching, that we make no distinction of purpose between the religious and "moral" lesson, even if the assignment of separate hours be found helpful in practice. It also follows that the lesson is less than the life. "Among the great teachers of the world," writes Seeley, "there is hardly one whose chosen pupils have received so few tenets in a formulated shape as those of Christ."¹ And he goes on to ascribe to the day-school teacher a greater opportunity and a greater responsibility for the moral and religious uplifting of the community than are possessed by any other of its members—not excluding the Ministry. It is not because the teacher can give direct instruction on five days instead of one, but because the life is more than the lesson. In plain fact, where the general school life is shallow or inconsistent, there the Moral Lesson is futile or worse. And our national failure, considered here as the failure of the schools, is less likely to be due to the dearth of direct moral teaching than to the obscuring of the moral ideal in the general school

¹ *Ecce Homo*.

life. Not till we have taught the sacredness of the secular can we win right reverence for the sacred. Not till the whole school environment and the whole curriculum visibly incarnates the moral ideal, will the Moral Lesson be able to interpret it. Nothing short of Herbart's conviction can meet the need of any school to-day—that "the demarcation of sacred and secular is fatal to both."

But the moral ideal is commonly obscured, not only by the ignoring of spiritual values in the secular teaching, but by the spirit and method of school work. Where the school promotes competition of the individual against his fellows and the winning of a private advantage to the exclusion of others, there the moral ideal is not only obscured, but perverted. Co-operation, and not competition, must be the impelling power. Or rather, accepting both factors as "natural" and serviceable, co-operation must always be the dominant one, and even competition must be co-operative. It is so in all the best games. And teachers who have accepted the principle find no lack of opportunity for applying it, both in work and play and in countless school enterprises of social service. Especially has it been remarked by teachers that the recent development of Manual Work gives fuller scope to the co-operative principle, the boy, instead of jealously screening his work (often according to orders) to prevent his neighbour from cribbing, now turning to help a weaker comrade. Mr. MacMunn's method of partnership promotes the same spirit in the ordinary class-subjects.¹ But we have not yet justified the

¹ See Norman MacMunn, *A Path to Freedom in the School*. Bell.

contrast drawn in our favour by Sir W. M. Ramsay,¹ "In Britain the boy would be punished by the master if he told on his neighbour. In Prussia he is punished if he does not tell." In two of the three English Elementary Schools in which the writer has taught, there is a recognised practice of putting one child to watch the class and report any one who speaks. While such methods are tolerated it is a mockery to give moral lessons on the Christian basis of fellowship. While cheating and churlishness seem to be the main alternatives of conduct, cheats and churls will abound. While the accepted aim in school is the defeating of one individual by another, the greater society outside may look in vain for peace between classes and between nations.

IV. "The obscuring of the moral ideal in the general school life" brings us straight to the question of practical discipline. It also brings us back to the central principle, the question of Interest. It is the want of Intrinsic Interest, which created for the older mechanical type of education the vast majority of its problems of discipline. And if these problems are still with us, it is partly as a miserable heirloom (we have to allow for this) partly because of external wrong conditions which frustrate all progress, partly because there is still a dearth of interest and interests. Through the better Training Colleges and through the growth of social sympathy this lack is rapidly being supplied, and problems of discipline are correspondingly less. But external conditions and actual school-methods are slow to come into line.

¹ Letter in *Daily Chronicle*, January 15, 1915.

Here, then, the question of discipline is to be considered in close relation to the national failure on the one hand and Interest on the other. For these things go far to explain each other. It is the faith of Humanism that the discipline of intrinsic interest in the thing learnt and in the moral achievement of learning it will persist into adult life, as the power of effort and as lasting self-control. But the discipline of coercion and of fear will be cast aside with the school primer, to be replaced perhaps by the utter moral anarchy of the loafer, the work-shy, the drunkard, the brutal ill-user of women and children. It is a sufficiently bewildering fact that nine years of schooling can result in these "characters." But we are beginning to find, in this central theme of Interest, some thread of explanation and some thread of hope.

Is not common naughtiness in school traceable to two main causes, restlessness and boredom? (We are only talking commonplaces here.) We may hope to cure the first by a more reasonably generous allowance of play and physical exercise, supplemented all round by a better physical environment. These things we have discussed in the fourth chapter. We need grudge none of them now that our attention is turned to the moral issue; for cleanliness is a good second to godliness, and "play at its best is only a school of Ethics."¹

And for the second trouble, boredom, still more obviously the cure lies in a more generous allowance of Interest. "The enlargement of the realm of interest is especially the work of the school," says Professor Welton, and the study of Interest

¹ Stanley Hall.

is above all things the practical study for the teacher. Its formal analysis into Intrinsic and Extrinsic,¹ or Mediate and Immediate,² and again into Practical, Intellectual and Emotional Interest, soon puts on life and reality as every lesson of every day furnishes its living illustrations and tests, and verifies anew the main principles of the theory, *e. g.*—

- (I) The superiority of intrinsic over extrinsic Interest—of the lesson taught and learnt in joy over the lesson taught and learnt for fear of consequences or for hope of reward.
- (II) The doleful necessity of supplementing intrinsic by extrinsic interest, especially in dealing with large numbers; and the consequent impossibility of the best kind of teaching in a class of sixty.
- (III) The cheering possibility of converting extrinsic into intrinsic Interest. The child who learns first through fear or emulation may come to learn through love.
- (IV) The predominance in children of practical and emotional Interest over intellectual; and the futility of providing for them a curriculum which satisfies, only or mainly, the latter.

These and similar applications of the Interest theory are more and more becoming the theoretical commonplaces of the trained teacher, and more

¹ Mitchell, *Structure and Growth of Mind*.

² Dewey, *Moral Principles in Education*.

and more are the practical difficulties of discipline being solved by them. Thus a Head Teacher whose school, in a specially poor district, is conspicuously happy in its discipline, explains her general principle very simply: "Make the subject so interesting that they don't want to be naughty." And the same school has solved its chief practical problem in discipline by forming a special class for girls of very low mental capacity (not quite included among the Mentally Deficient), and providing them with a greater share of practical interest through manual work. Successful Probation Homes and Industrial Schools of course use the same principle. It is not a mere matter of compensating for mental dulness by manual dexterity, or of tiding over emergencies. The combined evidence of these experiments goes to show that the free development of practical Interest is altogether beneficial to intellectual development.¹

Where Intrinsic Interest is strong, Extrinsic Interest need seldom be called upon. Certain High Schools and other Schools, not thwarted by wrong external conditions, have done good service by their clear demonstration of this, dispensing not only with prizes but with the ordinary system of marks and all individualistic competition, and attaining a standard of work far above the average. But to cope with the unreasonable conditions of large classes, taught often amid the noise of traffic, or in a room shared by another class—conditions which make all our talk of Intrinsic Interest a matter of bitter jest—Extrinsic Interests are in-

¹ See the concise and conclusive evidence of Cheetham's Hospital, quoted by Welton, *Psychology of Education*, p. 203.

evitable, and skill in teaching comes to mean skill in devices for multiplying such Extrinsic Interests. Accepting the necessity, we can all give preference to the more helpful of these—to the positive Extrinsic Interests above the negative and deterrent. Praise, rewards, and emulation (preferably not of individuals, but of groups or classes), are by common consent the best of such devices. These we must emphasise, remembering that even these are second-bests and makeshifts, and that to foster the individual competitive spirit in school is to play into the hands of the industrial system at its worst, and to postpone the day of international peace.

There is also the moral emotional Interest in all achievement, more valuable than these special and temporary Interests, because it can be made a "habitude," a trend of character for life, and can survive the sharp and sudden withdrawal of other Interests and of external control. It is what Mitchell¹ calls the "Interest in Achieving" as contrasted with any interest in the object or thing to be achieved. And of all Extrinsic Interests it is the best and the most universal, leading again and again to some genuine Intrinsic Interest, which without it would never be reached; and, if this again fails at some stage of extreme hardness, itself coming to the rescue in a new form as the last Intrinsic Interest, when all others fail—the "Interest in Achieving"—the purpose not to be beaten.

"If you can force your heart and mind and sinew
To serve their turn long after they are gone,
And so hold on, when there is nothing in you
Except the will which says to them 'hold on!'"²

¹ *Structure and Growth of Mind*, Lecture IV.

² Kipling, "Rewards and Fairies."

It has a grandeur and a permanence, this moral "Interest in Achieving." It can do great things. It is the stronghold of that older educational theory which clings to drudgery and relies on the element of sheer hardness for its best results. But for Humanism it is still only the second best, and the Intrinsic Interest of love is greater yet. For the Interest in Achieving, though it may build Jerusalem, city of the free, may also build Babylon through the agony of uncounted slaves. If it can carry the dying Bede to the end of his gospel of John, it can also carry Napoleon to his last defiance in war and slaughter. Neither Humanism nor Christianity accepts this ideal of desperate struggle as final. The last word of the doctrine of Interest is not this. Rather it is expressed by Nettleship—

"Interest at its highest power is love; and if we could be interested in all things we should be on the way to love all things; and that is God."¹

If, in accepting this new definition of Interest, we are taken out of our depth, so is every one who touches truth.

At least let us make up our minds whether we accept or reject the ideal of Intrinsic interest as the principle and source of discipline. For otherwise the discussion of ways and means is very weary and unprofitable. And at least let us admit the futility of a discipline which ends abruptly and utterly so soon as the Extrinsic Interest of fear ends.

Even the graver troubles, when restlessness reaches open antagonism, what are they but a clash

¹ *Philosophical Lectures and Remains.*

and confusion of Interests—the outcome of an antiquated but amazingly obdurate belief in the mind of teacher or pupil that their Interests are divergent? In too many boys' classes, even to-day, the Master deliberately takes his stand on the Old Testament basis of fear and threat, believing as one of them asserted (after reminding the writer of Eli and his sons, and of the froward Israelites), that "they've got to find some one strong enough to break their will." Yet every Training College worthy of the name has long since emended this doctrine into its Humanist and Christian version: "They've got to find some one strong enough to help them to be strong." The Master in question added two significant facts, that his class was always unruly except in his presence; and that his little five-year-old son at home was a cause of much grief to his parents by his quite unaccountable wickedness, against which no amount of chastisement was of any avail! This school, a Scotch one, of eleven hundred boys and girls, was a model of perfect organisation, with military discipline and a highly autocratic government. The Head Master, who 'shared his chief Assistant's unconscious disbelief in the New Testament and in all modern educational theory, imposed on his staff not only fixed Syllabuses in subjects where they were not already fixed by the Board, including the Moral Lesson and the weekly Temperance Lesson, but a rigid method of allotting marks and even half-marks. The predominance of the Fear-Interest was visible among staff and children. Both the men referred to, having emerged with just pride from grim ordeals of older days and a

brutal discipline, were persuaded that such "saving by fire" was the only saving possible, no matter how few were the saved, and how many the lost.

Corporal punishment is our next unwelcome topic, inevitably presented at this point, but little likely to be profitable, since change of individual opinion on the matter is as rare in the present as change of corporate opinion in the near future is certain.

Facts shall speak first to those that have ears to hear, and not only prejudices to be cherished. (I) A good school invariably uses little or no corporal punishment; a bad school frequently uses much. (II) In any individual school the class with the largest punishment-record (fourteen or sixteen canings a day was a common entry in some classes in Scotch schools) is the class with worst results, moral and intellectual. (III) For boys and girls of exceptionally bad or difficult character the best results are obtained where corporal punishment is not used. The Little Commonwealth in Dorsetshire carries on its work of the moral reformation of boy and girl offenders with continually increasing success, and with no corporal punishment.

These are some of the answers of fact to those who advocate corporal punishment either as the ordinary method or for the extreme case. And the question of theory has been determined by the whole discussion of Interest. For corporal punishment is the extreme instance of Extrinsic Interest, and being negative and deterrent, it takes rank as the lowest and least educational of such Interests.

Those who freely admit the theory will still perhaps deny its applicability in extreme cases.

They have the support of Mulcaster, who asks plaintively: "What should that child be without beating who even with it can hardly be reclaimed?" But for those who ask the question to-day we have, again, the answer of facts. We know that precisely those children and adolescents who "with it can hardly be reclaimed" are reclaimed without it by the Little Commonwealth and by its better known fore-runners, the Junior Republics in America. All of us are required at least to reconsider our preconceived notions of discipline by very new and very clear evidence such as this, and to ask what are the principles for which the experiments stand. They are two in number and very simple—self-government and citizenship. That is, they rely everywhere on Intrinsic Interest, nowhere on external control, and everywhere on the social Interest more than on the individual. "Yes," agreed one of the girl citizens, "Bermondsey was awful dull—but there was always the shop-lifting." And for incessant shop-lifting she had been sent to the Little Commonwealth, to find in the self-government of the Citizens an even more absorbing Interest.

The peculiar force of the evidence of this and similar experiments is its answer to those who uphold the discipline of compulsion and corporal punishment "for the extreme case." Probably every one of the citizens of the Little Commonwealth was an "extreme case" at school. Certainly though their brain power is above, and not below, the average, several of them failed even to master the three R's, and are now trying of their own will to make good the deficiency. And for the most

part they have repeatedly baffled the police, and have been convicted at last of some grave offence. But the moral reclamation achieved through the consistent working of the principles of self-government and citizenship is a thing so genuine that the standard of conduct enforced by the citizens on themselves is now definitely in advance of that which is exacted in the outside world. It is enforced by public opinion and by the business-like proceedings of the weekly court, which is purely democratic, the adults taking no more share than the young citizens, who for the most part rely on the ruling of their elected Judge.¹ Of the twenty charges brought on one court night, when the writer was present, a few of the most typical may be mentioned: smoking at wrong hours or in wrong places, inconsiderate use of property, shouting or rough play, inconsiderate driving of the farm horses uphill. All these were dealt with summarily, and more or less drastically, by the sentence of the Judge or, if she was in doubt, by popular vote. The personal note was curiously absent, even though accuser and accused faced each other on every occasion. The wrong was invariably regarded as done not to the individual but to the community. And the strongest impression left with the spectator was that of a most powerful public opinion, in rapid process of development, but already acting steadily and consistently for good, and fostering in every individual a deep personal interest in the common welfare.

But the whole community of the Little Common-

¹ At the time of the writer's visit, a girl of fifteen, who had been re-elected.

wealth numbers fifty, Instructors, Helpers, Montessori Babies and Citizens included. And the Teaching Staff numbers seven. Therefore it is possible for the Elementary Teacher, faced single-handed by a class of sixty, to discount this evidence heavily as inapplicable to his case. If the question of right moral training is really to this extent a question of the numbers dealt with, what greater condemnation could there be of the too-large class, and how long is the necessary reform to be delayed?

And, granting the aggravation of the problem by excessive numbers, we still most seriously hold that corporal punishment is too high a price to pay for the sake of the external order of the school, or even for the sake of the offender. His reclamation is at best precarious, and for the school every infliction of corporal punishment is the open surrender, for the time, of the Humanist ideal. It is no longer a "sanctuary of manners, deeds and words," as Vittorino planned it, nor a "sanctuary against fear," as Ascham desired it to be, nor a "place of gentle discipline," such as Elyot required. Even the rare infliction for grave moral offence sacrifices all this for the time, and no possible gain to the offender can compensate for the harm necessarily caused to the school by the sudden shattering of ideals. As for the habitual practice of individual teachers, even to-day, of inflicting blows for intellectual blunders and small negligences, it recalls too painfully certain ugly epochs in educational history (for which Monroe suggests that the Teaching profession still owes vicarious penance) when "grammar and flagellation, twin brothers,"

went ever hand in hand, and school flogging-days were, for certain "cruel and irous schoolmasters" of the type expressly forbidden by Elyot, days of high festival which they invited their brother pedagogues to share. In the twentieth century is it any more tolerable that a young master, fresh from a Scotch University, should habitually administer the tawse, for mistakes in Arithmetic, to girls of eleven, or that in England a position of high responsibility should be held by a woman teacher who, by her own admission in speaking of the girls in her charge, "can't keep her fingers off some of them," and considers that "those girls' faces weren't made except to be slapped"?

From the ideal of education based on pure intrinsic Interest we have dropped to the actual degradation of facts imparted by brute force. Most certainly the ideal is doomed to obscurity so long as even the possibility of such degradation remains. So long as the exception, the "extreme case," is admitted as justifying corporal punishment, so long will teachers of the wrong type continue to provide the exceptions, and greatly to hinder their colleagues in the establishment of the true discipline of Interest and self-government. The final and universal abolition of corporal punishment in school is the only hope of settlement, and the first condition of a higher order of discipline. But there must be the free right of dismissal, as Arnold claimed and exercised it, not necessarily implying public expulsion and disgrace, but, in the case of the Elementary School, to be used in close connection with the system of Probation Officers attached to the Children's

Courts. Our last word on the subject is this, that the obedience of fear is not worth the price of its attainment.

We have dwelt long on this last cause of failure—an erroneous school-discipline which has appealed too much to the lowest extrinsic Interest. In its place the clear line of advance must be through an increase of right Interest, as far as possible Intrinsic. Besides the genuine Interest in the subjects of the Curriculum, which the Training Colleges are at present mainly concerned to promote, we have already foreshadowed in the discussion two others, the Interest in self-government and the Interest in citizenship and social service. The chapter must end with a more clear and concentrated appeal for these, as the most urgent educational need of our own day, and the peculiar charge entrusted to this generation of teachers. The two cannot well be realised, or considered, apart from each other. On their combined strength, the Little Commonwealth and the George Junior Republic, dealing with delinquents, build their triumphant character-structures. We have seen the peculiar value of this evidence. But for every normal child at school the awakening of the fellowship-ideal and the enlargement of Interest from the individual to the social outlook is the great central experience, the true “conversion.” Probably from the Infants’ School upwards there is preparation for the experience. Certainly experience shows that at the age of twelve, the Fourth Form of a Secondary School and the highest classes of an Elementary are ready for it—ready

not merely to include the social Interest but to make it supreme. We cannot here accept Dr. Kerschensteiner's repeated assertion that civic instruction and training cannot begin in the Elementary School because the children are too young. The last two years—the "Supplementary" years of the Scotch schools—seem rather to be the ideal time for introducing it. But we fully admit that its richest development belongs to the years from fourteen to twenty-one. This is denied to the Elementary scholar and only reaped by those Secondary Schools and Universities which care to foster it. They are too few. "Civics" is still an outlandish subject in the view of most schools, and a Chair of Civics still an outlandish rarity, scarcely to be found in our Universities. As an intellectual Interest citizenship is starved in our Educational Scheme, and as a practical Interest still more so. The exceptions are not forgotten. "Forty years ago," says Professor Leonard, "Clifton College did an entirely novel and unheard of thing when it began to 'interest itself' and its boys in a poor parish of working people." There are now few of our good Secondary and "Public" and High schools which are quite without such practical social Interest. Sometimes, by combination, the resulting work is on a considerable scale, such as that of the United Girls' School Mission in South London, supported by more than a hundred schools. But the total achievement of the schools in Social Service, compared with the opportunity and the need, is very pitiful. It is safe to say that the difficulty is scarcely ever in arousing such Interest within the school. But initiative among

the Staff is often lacking, and fantastic interferences by governing bodies are fairly frequent. The governors of one Secondary School explicitly forbade all contributions of scholars' money for any purpose outside the school's own benefit.

In Elementary Schools, as the Social Worker will readily believe, and as the teacher knows, the generous impulse is at least as strong among the children. Though its means of outlet are fewer, yet one such school in Birmingham can raise, by pence and farthings, a sum of several pounds in response to any special appeal from those in need. Nor is it to be implied that such money-levies are the only, or the best, outlet for the practical social Interest.

And given the practical social Interest and an outlet for it, the intellectual Interest follows hot upon it. Lessons in Civics divorced from deeds of citizenship are questionable. Like the Moral Lesson, they may be "an abomination." But with their practical development in social service they may well become what Professor Dewey would have them, the key-stone of the whole curriculum.

"Interest in community welfare, an interest that is intellectual and practical, as well as emotional—an interest, that is to say, in perceiving whatever makes for social order and progress, and in carrying these principles into execution—is the moral habit to which all the special school habits must be related if they are to be animated by the breath of life."¹

Towards this we are moving, so that even now Reginald Bray can say that our "Elementary

¹ *Moral Principles of Education.*

Schools are beginning to become Schools of Citizenship," not merely "training grounds of the mind." Greater than any intellectual gain is the gain to himself and to the nation, of the child whom education finds "an isolated unit" and whom it leaves "an active member of an interrelated brotherhood."¹

It is to be remembered, of course, that after its awakening, the expansion of the social Interest must be gradual, and that it is the teacher's responsibility to guide it through right and reasonable stages, such as those suggested by Mr. Bray,¹ of home, school, city, and country. Vague talk of humanity, he rightly maintains, is talk in an unknown tongue to young children, and the command to love humanity as useful as the command to love the Atlantic Ocean. Centres and well-defined spheres of interest and active service there must be. But the boundary at each stage is only there in order to be superseded. The acceptance of any boundary—such as that of country or empire—as final, is the abandonment of the principle itself on which the social interest is based. It is just here that the German ideal—even in Dr. Kerschensteiner's wide view—most gravely conflicts with Humanism, by confining the social Interest within the national limit.

Therefore, and this corollary is quite necessary, and rightly reasserted by a brave minority at every Annual Conference of Head Masters, every school that accepts a Humanist basis and a Humanist ideal of education must inevitably become a centre of peace-propaganda. The question of disarm-

¹ *The Town Child.*

ment is to be transferred by education from the status of things dimly desired to the status of things inevitable; and it would have been so transferred long ago had education been consistently Humanist. The great "public" schools are however retaining and even emphasising the military spirit, at tremendous educational risk, and with utter educational inconsistency, for the sake of qualities which are indeed necessary but which do not depend on this method. The Boy Scouts movement is typical of many others which have already given proof of better alternatives from the juvenile standpoint; from an adolescent and adult point of view the alternative is given luminously by any Student Movement Conference,¹ or by such clear and strong pronouncements as Peile's Bampton Lecture on "War and Commerce."² It must be added that the Elementary Schools, being less bound by tradition than the Public Schools, and often more open to the temper and influence of the Labour Party, are doing a better national service in this respect, in many cases deliberately and skilfully promoting the peace-spirit, by actual teaching, by Empire Day ceremonies from which Jingoism is eliminated, by school correspondence with the colonies, and by international visits of school-children. The growth of the social Interest is to be graduated; but it is not to stop short of the universal Brotherhood. We dissociate ourselves, therefore, not only from Bernhardt's scornful dismissal to "Utopia" of any educational scheme

¹ See *Christ and Human Need*, The Papers of the Liverpool Conference, 1911.

² Bampton Lectures, *The Reproach of the Gospel* [Peile].

which transcends the national view-point,¹ but also from Dr. Kerschensteiner's more reluctant statement: "It seems to me impossible to attain with such purely national forces to an education which shall rise above the nation."² In answer to both we maintain that there is no true nationalism which does not transcend itself, and that the Social Interest which realises itself through smaller fellowships must seek its fullest expression in the universal society.

The achieving of the social Interest is the achieving of self-government. We have called them inseparable. For the cure of every curable personal failing is work for a cause or a community, and, alike for the hooligan and the prig, the Direct Moral Lesson is a less hopeful remedy than the Civics Lesson with a practical application. If we admit that social virtue is a greater and a fairer thing than individual virtue, we need not quarrel with this suggestion. Only we must secure the "practical application," and "never excite enthusiasm and then let it burn itself out without issuing in some definite action."³ The interest is to be that of "an active member of an interrelated brotherhood."

We are back again at the Alpha and Omega of our Subject. The "Enlarged Interest," intellectual, practical, emotional, reaching out into service and deepening into love—this is the purpose of the school, for this is the appointed highway to God.

¹ *Germany and the Next War.*

² *The Schools and the Nation.*

³ Bray, *The Town Child.*

FOR REFERENCE

- LAURIE. *Educational Opinion from the Renaissance*. Cambridge University Press.
- BRAY. *The Town Child*. Fisher Unwin.
- LEONARD. *Education and the Social Problem*.
- SADLER. *Moral Education and Training in Schools*. Longmans.
- NETTLESHIP. *Lectures on the Republic of Plato*. Macmillan.
- MITCHELL. *Structure and Growth of Mind*. Macmillan.
- WELTON. *Psychology of Education*. Macmillan.
- MACMUNN. *A Path to Freedom in the School*. Bell.
- A. B. DE BARY. *Letters of a School Ma'am*. Dent.
- MACKINDER. *The Modern British State: an Introduction to the Study of Civics*. Philip.
- JENKS. *Citizenship in the Schools*. Holt.
- PENSTONE. *Town Study*. Frowde and Hodder.
- SWANN. *Primer of English Citizenship*. Longmans.
- PUBLICATIONS of Moral Education League, 6 York Buildings, Adelphi, W.C.

CHAPTER VIII

LEISURE

IDEAL AND REAL LEISURE.

THE THREE DEMANDS OF LEISURE.

THE THREE CHIEF RESOURCES FOR LEISURE NOW
AVAILABLE—

The Street, The Cinematograph, The Public-
house.

THE THREE BEST ALTERNATIVES NOW AVAILABLE—

The Park, The Free Library, The Club.

FURTHER RESOURCES FOR LEISURE.

THE SCHOOL AS A TRAINING FOR LEISURE.

THE AMOUNT OF LEISURE—

Employment of Children Act and By-Laws.

School Days.

Industrial Days.

Holidays.

CHAPTER VIII

LEISURE

"Then will our youth dwell in a land of health and fair sights and sounds, and receive the good in everything ; and beauty, the effluence of fair works, shall flow into the eye and ear, like a health-giving breeze from a purer region, and insensibly draw the soul from earliest years into likeness and sympathy with the beauty of reason."—PLATO (Jowett's translation).

PLATO's ideal education is also ideal leisure. It is one unbroken human life for which we have to plan, in school, in industry, and in leisure, and if the environment of any one of these three be poisonous, it is the whole life that is poisoned. Some would say that the leisure question is the most important of the three, just because it is more within the "free" choice of the individual, less determined by external control, giving fuller scope to the likes and dislikes which are rightly regarded as the very core of individuality. Certainly the Care Committee Helper soon realises that the leisure of the boy and girl is at least as critical a question as their employment in work-hours. And of teachers there is a growing number who will accept Mr. Paton's view of their extended responsibility, beyond the school walls and the school hours, and will perhaps join in his demands for extended powers of teachers to control, if necessary, leisure also. At least it will be admitted by teachers who

count their business not instruction, but education, that twenty-seven and a half hours out of one hundred and sixty-eight is an insufficient weekly allowance for the purpose, if the remaining one hundred and forty and a half are either neutral or hostile in their educational meaning.

With this recognition, then, that the subject of leisure is in itself of exceeding importance, and is also the specially direct concern of teachers and social workers, we begin the discussion, ruling out as far as possible anything desultory or vague or sentimental. If the word itself conveys suggestions of things desultory, vague or sentimental, that is far from its original and true meaning—*σχολή*—a word so full of positive content, and implying such genuine enrichment, culture and liberty, that it could be used either for the “school” or for the “leisure” which made provision for these things. And if the word is now emptied for us of this positive content, if it stands now for negative things—for empty time and absence of activity—is it not because for so many their actual leisure does mean only this?

We must be careful to think clearly. Are we to consider leisure under ideal circumstances, in some Utopia with a six hours' working day, where the work itself is varied and refreshing, the leisure varied and ample? Are we to consider leisure in a New Jerusalem so spaciouly planned and so clean from vice that it may safely be filled with “boys and girls playing in the streets thereof”? Or are we to consider leisure as it actually exists for the industrial workers and for their children?

The answer is, we are deliberately to keep in

view both things, what is and what might be; what can reasonably be taken in hand at once, and what is the ultimate purpose which directs the effort at every step, and makes it worth while, however difficult. As to "what might be," Thomas More is probably very correct, on physical, mental and moral grounds, in his choice of a six hours' working day for all adults. And for the children we shall certainly do well to aim at such an adequate Town Planning Act that in every city they may safely play, if not "in the streets thereof," at least in ample and accessible playgrounds. But behind the question of the *amount* of leisure available both for children and adults lies the whole of the industrial problem; and behind the question of the *kind* of leisure available for both lies the whole of the education problem. Therefore let us think clearly, and, having a true standard of leisure always in view whereby to test all existing forms, let us concentrate on certain central conditions.

After a five and a half hours' school day or a ten hours' factory day (and we shall urge in the next chapter that the present abrupt transition from one to the other at fourteen years is obviously unsafe), leisure has to supply three great needs: physical refreshment, mental refreshment and free social intercourse. The refreshment comes best sometimes through activity and sometimes through rest, and its quality must always be determined according to individual need and the kind of work which has preceded leisure. But these three are the needs that are felt, and ought to be felt, as making the chief claim on leisure.

They are too great to be set aside, and too urgent

to wait for ideal satisfaction. Accordingly we find that in our cities they are actually met in some sense by various customs and institutions, and chiefly by three: the street, the Picture House, and, for adults, the Public-house. There are plenty of rivals, but at present these three are in fact the main purveyors of physical recreation, of mental excitement and of social interest. Statistics, if for such a general survey they were available, could only confirm the unvarying evidence of any visit to the back streets of a city at evening and night. Even in winter the streets, and especially the poorest, have their thick population; and in summer they are crowded. A little before 9 p.m. they are often so blocked by the Cinemas, disgorging between the two performances, that progress is difficult. And the third factor, the Public-house, keeps its steady grip, always tightened on Saturdays, and on any night between 9 and 10 p.m.¹ If we accept the test of numbers, these three things—the street, the Cinema and the Public-house—provide the main material for the people's leisure over the main area of industrialism. They will do so until education has accepted its share of responsibility for the facts, and its central obligation to teach a right appreciation of values, sound likes and dislikes, and the power of right choice.

Teachers, at least, will need no convincing that the leisure of their children, as provided by the street and the Picture House, is far from beneficial. Think of the streets! There is no need for forced

¹ See the figures given by Mr. Rowntree's investigators concerning the entries and exits at Public-houses in York, *Poverty*, p. 315.

sentiment or twisted evidence. The plain, dispassionate observations made by day and night in slum areas move round and round in the same dreary ring of wrongful environment, with the same few elements outstanding in a monotonous supremacy above the rest—the unprotectedness of child-life, the general unsightliness, unsavouriness and unsoundliness made up of countless half-observed elements, such as actual ugliness of buildings, dirt, waste paper, bad advertisements, street cries and street brawls, and heavy traffic, all combining to give a “sense-training” which must be a mighty factor in the child’s education, and mighty for evil.

The same is true of the moral training of the streets, with its unwholesome mixture of dulness and false excitement. Through the day there may be hours of monotony, until a sudden wild interest flares up round a policeman and an elusive book-maker, whom the neighbours conspire to protect, or round a drunken man and woman. But at night excitement is, for children at least, the prevailing feature, with lighted shops and more brilliantly lighted Picture Houses and Public-houses, with fried fish and chips assailing several senses at once, with street games for the more healthily active, and Public-house exits and entrances at lively street corners for the more curiously observant. These things, such writers as Pett Ridge and M. E. Loane have painted for us well enough and truly enough. Their graphic literary treatment is only less graphic than the scientific record of unadorned facts presented by social investigators such as Seebohm Rowntree in his *Poverty*. And seeing that we now

have abundant material, of both these kinds, for information, it is only necessary here to give ourselves the briefest reminder as teachers that such is in fact the environment—the all-important educational environment—for a far greater number of hours in every week than the hours of school.

The street's chief rival—and an easy victor when the pennies allow—is the Cinema. It has rendered at least one service, by showing how quickly, even in phlegmatic England, a thing can take hold. It ought at least to silence the wearisome talk of the necessity of slow and small beginnings, slow and gradual growth in all social enterprises. The Cinema was a social enterprise. It was not in the least slow or small or gradual. It burst into life, and it blazed into popularity. If educational motive had been the directing power, instead of commercial gain, there might have been an equally swift and sudden uprush of Cinemas, and every one of them to the good—every one of them a force co-operative with, instead of thwarting, the main trend of social and educational reform, every one of them helping to solve the problem of leisure instead of complicating it exceedingly. As usual the thing was realised too late, and the educational criticism of the Cinema began after its anti-educational element had taken firm hold.

Since the educational criticism began, the worst films have been forbidden, and a certain moral level guaranteed. But the present level is none that education can recognise, and the physical objections remain unchanged. Accordingly the opinion of teachers and experts is decisively adverse to the Cinema in its present average form. A recent Con-

ference of Head Teachers of Elementary Schools passed a resolution to this effect. The Lancashire verdict given by a number of teachers in 1913¹ is almost wholly unfavourable, on physical, mental and moral grounds, and the evidence obtained by the writer from the Head Teacher and Staff of many Elementary Schools follows, with impressive unanimity, the same line of censure. There is grave condemnation of the Picture House at its present level, with the frequent commentary that it *ought* to be a valuable educational asset, and that it might become so if educational experts and teachers had some right of censorship. "Proper pictures at proper hours" sums up the general desire.

The grounds of opinion, carefully stated in writing by these teachers, are important, since some of them would be valid against the Cinema in any form; others, and the majority, only apply to bad Cinemas. Certain moral objections apply even to the best, *e. g.* the encouragement of the tendency "to be a half-hearted spectator instead of a whole-hearted actor in life." And the physically bad effects seem inevitable. But many of the greatest objections apply only to inferior Cinemas—"the shockers such as we have seen posterred in this district lately," which cause "nightmare, mind-wandering, nerves, love of unhealthy sensation, use of knife and toy pistol"; the "maudlin sentimentality" and the "suggestion of crime." With this in view, those teachers are surely right who wish for reform rather than for abolition, and who definitely ask for a measure of control of the Cinema by some educational body.

¹ Published in the *Manchester Guardian*.

The verdict of the teachers so far confirms in every respect the experience of the writer and of social workers who have helped in the investigation both by inquiry and by personal attendance at Cinema shows. The main conclusions reached are as follows—

1. The low moral tone and the needless vulgarity of the Picture Houses most frequented by elementary school children and working boys and girls.
2. The physical evils of bad atmosphere and late hours.
3. The immense popularity of the Cinema.

All of these are implied, and dealt with, in the resolution passed by the National Association of Head Teachers at the 1914 Conference at Lincoln—

“This Conference wishes to draw attention to the important part which is being played in National life by the Cinematograph shows, and to impress upon the public the necessity, in the interests of morality, health and education, that the films displayed should be of a pure and elevating character, and that attendance of school children should be prohibited after 8.30 p.m., unless accompanied by their parents.”

To these three generally accepted conclusions let us add the obvious and important corollary—

4. The inadequacy and inability of other available resources of leisure to compete with the Cinema, and the futility of denouncing or suppressing it unless positive constructive schemes, on a large scale, are ready to supply its place.

The "low moral tone"—the first ground of accusation—is admittedly better than in the earliest days of the Cinema. Nevertheless, of a series of films witnessed in a large and rather sumptuous Picture Palace in the slums, supposed to have a high standard, there was not one which, on moral grounds, any teacher could deliberately sanction. The least objectionable of the three made merry over a school-girl's petty theft. The other two wallowed in the wrong kind of love-interest, one in a grossly vulgar setting, the other with the implication that a motor-car and furs give, if not an excuse, at least a glamour, to lax morality.

"My concern," says Canon Rawnsley, "is with the life of the child. It is impossible, in face of the report of the inspector of education at Liverpool and of the findings of the special committee that dealt with the licensing of cinematograph halls there, in face of the findings of the Birmingham Committee, in face of the report of the Lancashire Education Committee, and the Conference of School Teachers at York held a few weeks ago, in face of the finding of our own school attendance officers in Cumberland, not to realise that the Picture Palace, unregulated as far as children's admission goes, is one of the gravest dangers in the educational world that we have ever had to meet." ¹

It is significant that the schools whose verdict on the Picture House is comparatively lenient are those

¹ *Times Educational Supplement*, April 1914. Even when restrictions are imposed regarding children's admission in granting the licence, they may be ignored in practice, or even overruled by a higher authority, as in the Halifax case (*Theatre de Luxe v. Gledhill*) discussed in the *Times*, December 17 and 22, 1914.

in better localities, where the most degraded films would not be exhibited. It is the slum Picture House that is the most serious danger, and it is the children of the very poor who are finding in the worst and most sensational pictures such a welcome excitement amid dreariness that they are committing thefts for the sake of obtaining it. The Chief Probation Officer in Birmingham declares such cases to be frequent, and Mr. Freeman reports of the same town that twenty-one young persons in five months alleged that they stole in order to get money for the Picture Palace. "In Birmingham," he says, "the association between the Picture Palace and Juvenile Crime is so marked that the Justices have recently requested the General Purposes Committee to take into consideration the existing arrangements for the admission of children to these entertainments."¹

If this estimate of the prevailing moral standard of the Cinema is approximately true, then it would be well to obtain a still more comprehensive and concentrated expression of expert opinion, and without further delay to give it the widest possible publication, and then make it the ground of action. Especially such public expression of opinion is needed (i) from the whole body of teachers; (ii) from all social workers among children and adolescents; and (iii) from the juveniles and adolescents who most frequent the Picture Houses. If the demand for better Cinemas were organised and steadily maintained among these three sections of the community, the problem would be greatly simplified.

Is this possible? We deprecate any great ex-

¹ *Boy Life and Labour.*

penditure of time, money or effort on the statistical inquiry. But there are in every big town organisations which offer ready access to each of the three sections in question. There are the schools, first and foremost, which could, by the co-operation of all Head Teachers and their Assistants, at once form a nucleus for the movement of reform and the organising of the demand, and could also, by winning for the reform a general popularity among the children, guarantee to a very great extent its lasting success. And there are, secondly, organisations of social workers, such as Care Committees and Guilds of Help, ready to form a second nucleus of opinion. Thirdly, there are organisations of juveniles and adolescents, clubs, guilds, and societies, which stand for sound opinion among those most directly concerned. In Birmingham, the White Ribbon Band, which numbers some twelve thousand members, mainly working girls, could surely be used as this third nucleus of opinion, supported by the Federated Clubs. We have, did we but realise it and use it, the material for swift and efficient organising of all reforms touching children and juveniles. Certainly we have the material for organising an effective demand for good Cinemas. But let no one hope for success in any purely negative reform. The Cinema has come to stay—we can only see that it stays “for good.”

The second conclusion reached was the physical harm of the Cinema. Humanism, we have seen, makes no rigid separation between physical and moral evil, holding that what helps the body helps the spirit, and content with nothing less than the complete salvation of both. Thus at present even

a "good" Cinema is a mixed blessing, because of its double ill-effect on health—the risk to eyesight, and the loss of fresh air and exercise. It is on the physical ground, and not because of the moral tone, which is said to be high, that the Philadelphia "Movies" have been condemned by a recent Committee of investigation. Better films, better ventilation, better hours may lessen the physical evil, but it does not seem likely that the Cinema can ever be made to provide the ideal form of leisure.

As to the third point, the popularity of the Cinema, a single Picture House in the slums may have a weekly average attendance of 15,000. The average attendance of school children in England seems to be rather less than once a week; of juvenile workers it is perhaps more than once a week. The school average is probably not far different from that in Philadelphia, stated as five times a month for boys, three and a third times a month for girls.¹ But in cases like this the average is a less helpful fact than the "mode" of statistics, since the probability is that a very great number attend Cinemas either very frequently or very seldom. There is a type, for instance, among the roughest and poorest factory girls, which attends several nights a week. One such girl was found to go four times in a week, though in her home there was not always the possibility of dinner during the day. This girl has discarded all Clubs. Probably she represents a large number to whom the Cinema is the one welcome form of leisure available. She shall serve as comment on our fourth point also, the dearth of right resources.

¹ *The Survey*, May 9, 1914. See also Appendix.

With the streets and the Cinema we have exhausted the main resources of leisure for the child.¹ And we must not in this chapter discuss the third resource of the adult, though none knows better than the teacher and the social worker how emphatically the Public-house is the child's own problem. The child may be kept outside the doors of the Public-house, but the Public-house enters into the child's home, and destroys it. The Care Committee Helper who is given an "A" case (*i. e.* a boy or girl requiring much After-Care) may almost take for granted that his problem will be, not the child, but a drunken parent. Nor is there any security for the child's leisure while the leisure of the parent consists in degradation.

But probably the objection has long been in the reader's mind that there are other and better forms of leisure available, and that these have been ignored. They have not been ignored, but simply postponed, because in fact they count for less with the great majority of the children in question—because they are less available, and when available less used.

But now these alternatives claim full consideration, and upon them, their present achievements and their greater possibilities, all the constructive part of the chapter must be built.

For the first need, the need of physical refreshment, we are to substitute for the street the Parks. The Town Planning section of the 1909 Act is still

¹ The Music Hall does not seem to call for separate treatment here, partly because in fact it counts for less than the Cinematograph; partly because most of the above argument can be equally applied to it. But see Freeman, *Boy Life and Labour*, on this subject.

far less operative than the Housing section, and we wait for the compulsory stage of the Act to succeed the permissive. But even so the Parks are increasingly becoming such a substitute. In Birmingham this is directly due to the action of the Central Care Committee in promoting Organised Games in the Parks, with the result that, within a year, Parks which had been almost deserted were crowded with too many children for the available space. On the outskirts of the town, in a Park which was not only useless for the children, but actually a danger by reason of the undesirables who frequented it, the same measures are being adopted. It must at once be recognised that thorough supervision is necessary, especially in the initial stages of organising. We are not to tolerate even the possibility of grave abuse of this resource of leisure, nor such conditions as may render the Parks a moral danger instead of a social benefit; and we are not justified in overlooking the warning of the London Elementary Education Sub-Committee on the Teaching of Sex Hygiene, in regard to this danger. But the reform we have in view is the surest hope of redeeming the reproach. It is the way of safety as well as of progress. Till the Parks are recognised as places of free, enlightened play and free and blameless leisure, they must be adequately controlled by external authority, whether of the police or volunteers. Afterwards they will be controlled, and more efficiently, by the public opinion of those who appreciate their use. We must acknowledge, if we are honest, that here we are challenged to a wholly practical and practicable reform. The conditions of success seem to be—

1. Sufficient playing space in every town.
2. Sufficient skilled organisers and instructors for stated hours daily, with permanent police supervision of the ground.
3. Many Volunteer Helpers.
4. The co-operation and encouragement of Teachers in the Schools.

Given these things—and it is for the Town Council and the Teachers and the Social Workers to give them all—the Leisure problem, for fair weather at least, is no longer a grievous one for the Juveniles.

The weather question brings us opportunely to the consideration of the second need of leisure—mental refreshment—and to the second great resource, the Free Libraries. A very forlorn crusade they carry on, at present, if we count them as rivals to the Cinema. But here, too, averages are misleading. A child probably uses the Library much, or not at all. And what investigation does bring to light is the powerful influence of the School in this respect. One Birmingham School has so created the Book-lover's mind in its scholars that the Free Library is constantly in demand by them to supplement the eight hundred volumes which the School Library itself possesses. Another has a "Library" in the full sense—a room set apart and beautifully equipped for free, silent reading, each class above Standard III being given at least one period a week for this. Books are not taken home, because the Free Library is largely used. The Head Master of a third School (co-educational) states that "the *upper* classes use our school Library

very enthusiastically," and that the local Free Library is "fairly well used." Doubtless, in very many Schools the school and class libraries are encouraging the use of the Free Library. Moreover, the Education Committee has given direct encouragement by assuming responsibility for books taken out by the scholars. With these facilities infinite possibilities seem to await the fuller co-operation of the teacher in making Libraries take their rightful place among the resources of leisure. It is for the teacher to create the right kind of book-loving, and the love of the right books—to suggest titles, or rather authors, to give keys to new and difficult books, and fresh glamour to old favourites; to bring the ideals of literature right into the minds and lives of the readers; to give sound standards of hero-worship, and fair material for it; to develop by the out-of-school reading even more than by the direct teaching of the English lesson a right appreciation of values. And, again, it is for the body of teachers to create and to maintain the demand for sufficient Libraries, and for an ample and well-chosen Juvenile Section in each. As with the Cinemas, if the inferior supply comes first, it is because the demand for the superior is too weak or too dilatory.

We have to realise how new our responsibility is—that we are dealing with the first generation of industrial workers for whom wide reading is a practical possibility. Their parents were given mechanical facility in reading (though even to this there are exceptions to be found in every town). But they were given the means without the end—

reading without access to books, the Indirect Value without the Direct. Because of this, the old-fashioned Tory protest against the doings of 1870 is not all unjustified. Are the working man and his wife actually the better for their reading? In the first place, do they read? And in the second place, what do they read? Is it a force for good? Is it neutral? Or is it a force for evil? These questions are asked, and carefully and methodically answered, by Lady Bell's study of the working-class homes of Middlesborough.¹ The main conclusions of her chapter on "Reading," based on a detailed inquiry in two hundred homes, are not cheering. In only twenty-five of the two hundred were books read "that are absolutely worth reading," and only $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the population ever use the Free Library. One could wish every teacher to read this chapter, and then to register the conclusion that for the new generation there is every need, and every opportunity also, for a better standard.

In all seriousness, is not the Leisure question mainly solved for the child whose interests have been trained, and who has free access to a Park and a Library? The two prime needs, refreshment for mind and body, are met by these two things, and indirectly the third need also, the need of companionship. But the present evil housing conditions force us into further provision for leisure. Partly because there is so often no decent home in the background, and partly because the Parks and Libraries have not yet taken hold, some more definitely social organisation seems inevitable.

¹ Lady Bell, *At the Works*.

This third need is met by Clubs. And nowhere has the volunteer done worthier service than in the organising and management of Clubs. Even if every individual Club were a failure, it would have embodied a true principle—the effort to promote fellowship. And this, and not any instruction or discipline of mind or body, is the Club's central ideal. But Leisure is short; and if the Club encroaches on it, it must provide these other things as well as fellowship, realising a better fellowship by the inclusion of them. Further, the Club has to compete with the Cinema, with its superior size and brilliance and excitement, and the Club can only win by providing interests great and vivid enough to outweigh these attractions. This it can do if it will. It can give active participation in place of passive gazing at films, a personal interest instead of an impersonal, an enrichment of real experience instead of an illusion, and, above all, fellowship.

Out of the various elements of success or excellence in many Clubs, it is possible to fashion the ideals towards which we may work, especially as the causes of failure in individual Clubs seem to be always negative—omissions rather than actual error. The needful elements seem to be—

1. Physical enjoyment.
(Dancing, games, drill, rambles.)
2. Mental interest.
(Singing, reading, acting, debates, lectures, pictures, games of skill.)
3. Discipline, as a condition of both the former.
As far as possible, self-government of the Club by its members.

4. A frank and strong recognition of moral and religious values—not necessarily a religious element separated from other elements, but the spirit of reverence, of joy and of aspiration, expressed according to the members' need.
5. Fellowship within the Club.
6. Outside service rendered by the Club.

If the above points are too obvious to be of much service, or even to excite criticism, it is felt that further definition would mar the freedom of the ideal. In fact, the actual failures experienced in various Clubs do seem attributable to the absence of one or other of these six conditions. In many cases there has been rejection of all but the first, the physical aim; in many others neglect of just this one; again, in many the sectarian difficulty has been thought to necessitate the absence of an avowed religious principle. Others, especially when the dangerous stage of over-respectability and complacency is reached, might have been saved by a greater measure of self-government, still more by the undertaking of some outside social service. But those which live and grow seem to be those whose Fellowship ideal takes shape in the many-sided interests of Humanism, each interest intensified by the fellowship itself, and by the corporate effort towards the extension of benefits to those outside. Very significant is the strong vitality of an Edinburgh Club for Women Clerks and Shop Assistants, which has itself founded a Club for poorer workers—and of this latter also, which quickly, of its own initiative, undertook to work for the Deep Sea Fishermen.

Like Parkland and Bookland, Clubland is sadly insufficient to meet even the actual needs of the child and juvenile. Much less can it meet the demand which ought to be. We have discussed causes of failure in individual Clubs, but the whole Club movement is hindered beyond all telling by lack of co-operation in social and religious bodies. Infinite is the waste of funds, buildings, equipment, helpers through overlapping and isolation; endless the drifting and lapsing of members, especially at the all-critical school-leaving age on which we desire to concentrate. Small Clubs starve in miserable isolation which by co-operation might flourish; great ones sacrifice, through unwieldy size, that intimacy of personal relation which is worth more than numbers.

But every year is making the criticism less true, as Federation and Economy become more popular conceptions. Meanwhile it is for the Volunteer Helpers to increase their numbers and their efficiency, and for the Schools to increase the membership of Clubland by their encouragement and co-operation, so that supply and demand may increase together.

It is time to sum up our results thus far. We stated at the outset that the Leisure problem was the teacher's problem, and as great a one as that of School or Employment. But let it be admitted now that it is an easier one. It is less hampered by artificial restrictions, social or political. It can be dealt with broadly, swiftly and simply. It centres on the three great needs of Leisure: bodily refreshment, mental refreshment and social intercourse. It has already found three lines of right

satisfaction in Parks, in Libraries and in Clubs. It would seem that there is no more need of theorising, but only of an immense extension in practice.

With Parks, Libraries and Clubs we have not exhausted the right resources of leisure, but we have secured some satisfaction for the three chief needs, and we have tried to suggest principles which may guide and test other schemes also. One great existing resource, the Scout movement, obviously fulfils the conditions and meets all three needs. It has not received fuller treatment here because its present scope among girls is comparatively small, and not essentially different from that of Clubs. In accordance with the plan of the book, in questions which affect the two sexes differently, it has seemed better to give preference to the girls' point of view, which has less often been presented in educational literature. Especially in regard to boy-leisure, Mr. Bray and Mr. Freeman have attacked the problem with sufficient force already.¹

It might reasonably be objected, also, that we have omitted all mention of the greatest and best resource of all for the people's leisure—music, which, says Aristotle, "the gods gave to men for the rational enjoyment of leisure."² We omitted it, perhaps, for the same reason as we omitted sunshine in speaking of the Parks, or fires in speaking of winter Clubrooms. It is so indis-

¹ Bray, *The Town Child*; Freeman, *Boy Life and Labour*.

² The words recall to the writer a working-man friend in the slums, whose hobby is the making of musical instruments, and playing on them, and who sat up all night to finish a dulcimer for his wife's birthday. He says that whenever he takes out his "music" (meaning one of his instruments), he "forgets all the sorrows of the world."

pensable as to deserve to be taken for granted. But indeed we must here appeal for a more generous and more enlightened use of it. In spite of sentimental bigotry in some of our newspaper correspondence, not many of us are seriously proud of the fact that our soldiers cannot get beyond "Tipperary," and continue to inform us with discordant and excruciating monotony that even that is a long way to go. Music has yet to claim its rightful kingdom in Clubroom and in Park—yes, and in the street. One marvels that the good work done in the schools has not yet had sufficient influence outside to rule out, at least from public life, even degraded songs and degraded singing.

Also, with the help of recent developments in the curriculum, drawing and painting and various kinds of manual work ought now to be a much greater resource for the people's leisure than in fact they are. The schools are giving the needful preparation, but it seems they are not yet sufficiently socialised in their outlook. They are still too sharply isolated from the rest of life, as if, twice daily, at noon and at 4.30, there were for every child and teacher the solemn burial of one personality with all its interests, and the birth of another. A great hope may lie in the Continuation School, when it arrives, especially if drawing, music, and handwork are allowed their rightful prominence there; and it is to this, co-operating with the reformed teaching in the preparatory schools, that Dr. Kerschensteiner looks for the forging of new bonds between school and home, between parent and teacher. "What a breath of joy," he exclaims, "goes to-day through all our drawing classes!

What genius in decoration and construction has been suddenly liberated, and pours into the life of the home, like the flames of a great conflagration which seize on every inflammable substance in its neighbourhood ! ”

And, following on this, but altogether impracticable without it, we may look for some genuine popular appreciation of our national wealth in Art Galleries and Museums. More and more, if we can but meet the present emergency with emergency methods, will the leisure problem solve itself, and the resources and the power of enjoyment increase together. When the way is prepared in school by the creative mind and the “thinking hand,” then shall the eyes of the blind be opened.

The teacher, then, is asked to concentrate on a triple task—

- (i) To press with much importunity for an increase of the three chief resources of leisure—for more Parks, more Libraries, more Clubs.
- (ii) To encourage the use of them and the love of them.
- (iii) To give the needful training for the full enjoyment of leisure, both general adaptability and resource, and also such special knowledge or skill as may be wanted, *e.g.* for an organised game, or for the enjoyment of a book, a paint-box or a chisel.

And this triple claim must be made reasonable by a triple reform in our educational system—more

generous training for the teacher, more leisure for the teacher, and more direct co-operation between the school and the municipal Authorities.

One vexed question must be alluded to here, but referred to the next chapter for fuller discussion. Evening Schools, if full advantage were taken of them, would occupy a very considerable part of the available leisure of Juveniles. In certain cases they may provide the chief thing needed; but, if we are to be true to our own account of the objects of leisure, we cannot include them here among the wholly desirable resources.

We have devoted the greater part of this chapter to the discussion of the quality and conditions of leisure. But we cannot wholly omit the important question of its amount. Here legislation must come to the rescue of the Child, the Juvenile Worker, the Teacher and the Helper, for, while the working hours of both School Children and Juveniles are only partially, and very variably, controlled by law, any discussion of leisure in concrete instances is apt to become farcical. Even progressive By-laws do not remove the possibility of intolerable overwork; *e.g.* those of Leeds, which allow a "full-timer" to work for thirty-six hours in the week outside school — *i.e.* an eleven hours' day. In Birmingham, where By-laws to the 1913 Act are only under consideration, breaches of the Act are proportionately common. One Head Master reports that a boy in his school works fifty hours a week outside school hours, beginning at 5 a.m. daily, and that there are many worse cases. A Birmingham lather boy, in 1914, attempted suicide because of overwork. However, the needful By-laws are expected, and the Care

Committee is concerning itself with their construction, and with the hard question of street trading. In regard to the latter, it is recognised that licensing of the street-trading children is only a palliative, and that the trading itself ought to be stopped, especially for girls. A girl of thirteen, recently questioned by the writer while selling papers in the centre of the City, stated that she did this daily from 5.15 till 9. The father was in work, the child showed no signs of poverty. Certainly the 1/6 which she contributed to the family income seemed too dearly earned, at the price of her whole leisure, apart from the positive harm and risk of her employment. But, especially with the children of the poorer schools, such employment is very common and very excessive. Teachers, whose work is heavily handicapped by these overtired children, should surely be heard demanding with no uncertain voice speedy and drastic By-laws.

Considering the endless variety of the forms of employment of children both within and without the home, it seems impossible to obtain an accurate statement of the actual amount of leisure. The theoretical full amount for school children, from 12 till 2 and from 4.30 onwards, besides Saturday and Sunday, is, of course, a pure fiction, as the Compositions of Standard IV girls in a slum school testify. "How I spent my Saturday" is a rather sombre record of responsibilities shouldered by these children of ten or eleven, beginning in the early morning. Mother seems frequently to be "bad" on Saturdays, and to stay in bed while the child does the work of the house.

For the worker who has left school, leisure is

short indeed. A Club finds it hard to collect its members before 8.30 p.m., and overtime may reduce leisure to nothingness.

But there are holidays. Few and very insufficient in the case of the industrial worker, long enough, perhaps, but very precarious, for the school child, the holidays are the hardest part of the leisure problem. One can have few illusions about them while our Bank Holidays give their present interpretation of the people's "leisure," and while teachers habitually remark deterioration in the children after each long holiday. But here, too, if the needful co-operation is forthcoming, the way of improvement lies open. The Country Holiday movement is all to the good. It is available for many members of Clubs, for some factory workers as such, and for a great number of school children. But it needs a far wider reach. The great majority of the poorer industrial workers are not included. It is common enough to find those who have "never been away in their lives."

The school children, through the Country Holiday Fund, have a much greater chance. And here the co-operation of teachers has long been assured for the organising of the holiday. Can that co-operation be extended further, so that the children may not only go to the country, but go prepared to win the full happiness and good of it? Any one who has felt the gain of some sort of "introduction" to a new experience—say a picture gallery—from one who knows and loves already, will admit that for children going for the first time to the country some such preparation must be of great value. The teacher who encourages the child to

save up and go does much; but the teacher who sends him off equipped with a high ideal of what this leisure may mean, with appreciation, interest and expectation already quickened, will do much more. If we have known for ourselves that a great and wonderful renewing of our whole life is possible, just by means of "a country holiday," we shall be anxious to pass on the possibility of these things to the children. We shall readily accept, in the light of such experience, Mr. Bray's suggestion that "probably one of the greatest missionary agencies in London at the present time, judged from the strictly religious point of view, is the Children's Country Holiday Fund."

Is the Teacher, supported by an enlightened Education Authority, a progressive Town Council and an efficient Care Committee, to bear the whole responsibility for the child's leisure not only in schooldays, but afterwards? The writer is well aware that "home" has been omitted from the discussion, and desires very earnestly now to make the explanation clear, and to state in no uncertain terms the conviction that the ideal centre for Humanist education, physical, mental and moral, is the home. The whole plea is for swift emergency reforms, to ensure for the next generation homes worthy of the name. The whole object of the extraordinary demand here made on teachers and social workers is to win a sure basis for home life. Those families which possess such a basis already will not suffer by any outside "interference." Those which lack it can only be saved by an increased measure of public control of their children. Otherwise, is it not these children who

are destined to prolong the worst social problems into yet further generations?

Therefore, in our whole discussion, and especially in the discussion of Health, Character, and Leisure, we are laying the heavy load of responsibility on the teacher *for this generation*, believing that, if the charge can be accepted and fulfilled, the parents of the next generation will be more ready, because more able, to fulfil their trust. Meanwhile, we need not fear opposition, nor the "undermining of parental responsibility"—that frequent danger-cry. Who, in fact, are the parents who resent the "interference" of Care Committees and the like? Precisely those who have rendered it necessary by neglect. We are asking for emergency reforms until this class disappears from our ranks.

Until then, we have no right to refuse to recognise its existence, to blind our eyes to the fact that there are parents, however few, who commit child-murder for the sake of insurance,¹ and men—perhaps not a few—who, with a wage of 20/- and a family to support, spend 5/- weekly on tobacco and beer for themselves.² It is parents of this type who make necessary an emergency programme, because their presence is dragging down the level of the decent homes around them, as well as the level of all unskilled labour. When they are segregated in those Detention Colonies for which we wait too long, there will be a better hope of establishing parental responsibility. But surely Mr. Bray is right in arguing that now this dread of sacrificing parental responsibility is defeating

¹ Gorst, *Children of the Nation*, p. 47.

² Reported by a Head Master to the writer.

its own end. The worst enemy of the family, he asserts, is "the misdirected enthusiasm of its most ardent supporters, expressing itself by resisting all measures for the saving of home life."¹ Most ardently we desire liberty in the home. Most ardently we plead for such co-operation on the part of the parents that little by little the School Clinic, the Health Visitor, the After-Care Helper, the Country Holiday Fund, and even the Social Club, may cease to be necessary. In York there is already an organised group of working-class mothers who in turn take charge of groups of children in their home for certain hours on Sunday, provide them with occupations, and pass on to other parents the best results of this experiment in leisure. The "Neighbourhood Clubs" promoted by Settlements in the United States are approaching the same ideal, seeking to raise the standard of social life within the family and among near neighbours.² When the desired reform has been thus literally brought "home" everywhere, then we may rejoice in the closing of at least half our clubs even more than we now rejoice in their growth and increasing activity.

Meanwhile much is being done, and more can be done, towards enlisting as helpers parents who are now indifferent or hostile. Progress is slow, but even now Mr. Paterson's first-hand testimony is a little out of date: "The only times when parents and teachers meet are, as a rule, occasions of mutual blame and recrimination."³ Certainly a great many

¹ *The Town Child.*

² Stanton Coit, *Neighbourhood Guilds.*

³ *Across the Bridges.*

women teachers would refute the statement now. It is hard, with a class of sixty, to fulfil Richard Mulcaster's requirement, made even in the sixteenth century, that "parents and teachers should be not only acquainted, but on friendly terms with each other." But meetings of parents, teachers, Care Committee workers and elder scholars are becoming regular features of the After-Care system. Moreover, Sir John Gorst's statement is continually being verified, that by the visits of the Care Committee Helper parental responsibility is not stifled, but aroused. The same result is well established already in the case of Infant Health Visiting and "Mothers' and Babies' Welcome" Clubs throughout the country. All these agencies help to impress the worth of a child's life on the minds of those parents who have held it too cheap. Those who have not, so far from being hindered, are finding it more possible to carry out their ideals by the help of this outside co-operation. There is interest where there was neglect; there is confidence where there was heavy anxiety or despair.

Does it not all come back to this, that the vast majority of parents, teachers and helpers have only one purpose in regard to the child—its real welfare, so far as they understand it—and that only by co-operation can the purpose be realised? And just as, in the first chapter, appeal was made to teachers of every grade to unite for the winning of the most urgently needed reforms for the Elementary Schools, so here the appeal is to all parents to lend their aid to the most heavily handicapped among parents. If such organisations as the Associations of Assistant Masters and Mistresses in

Secondary Schools are censured for their unduly sectional character, still more the Parents' National Educational Union, by its very title, is challenged to render a far wider service and to extend its privilege.¹ No confusion of aims, no sacrifice of definite and practical activity within each group, is desired. But if the groups do thus become articulate and self-conscious, then a federation of them, and not a merely nominal one, is indispensable, both for the good of the whole community and for the efficiency of the groups. If indeed the gulf yawns wide between the member of the P.N.E.U. and the parent of the poorer type of Elementary Scholar, there could be no stronger proof of the need for such federation, and for a heavily graduated moral and intellectual income-tax, self-imposed by those who are rich in the possession of educational ideals and of resources for their attainment, for the benefit of those who are relatively destitute. At present, while working-class parents are only very imperfectly organised for educational ends,² while the working man scarcely recognises his responsibility here, and the working woman, if she does recognise it, can only be overwhelmed, the tax must be heavy on the privileged parents. But they, however willing, cannot meet the present need. And it is on the teachers of the Elementary Schools that one must rely most of all to cope with the emergency.

It is all-important, in view of this conclusion, that the strain of the teacher's work in school shall

¹ Such an extended service is definitely undertaken in certain centres, notably in Liverpool, where there is a branch of the P.N.E.U. composed of working women, in connection with the Victoria settlement.

² As, for example, in Adult Schools, or the Mothers' Unions.

be lessened, in order that the deeper responsibility may be discharged. The demands we are making in regard to leisure must presuppose the smaller class. At present, the wonder lies in the amount of voluntary work done out of school by a very great number of teachers. In spite of wrong conditions and excessive strain these have accepted the Humanist view of their profession, that "the didactic art has to be studied in the interests of Parents, Teachers, Pupils, the Commonwealth, the Church, and Heaven."

FOR REFERENCE

- ADDAMS. *The Spirit of Youth and the City Streets*. Macmillan.
 FREEMAN. *Boy Life and Labour*. King.
 BELL. *At the Works*. Arnold.
 BRAY. *The Town Child*. Fisher Unwin.
 BARON. *The Growing Generation*. Student Christian Movement.
 WOODS AND KENNEDY. *Young Working Girls*. Houghton Mifflin Co.
 LEESON. *The Probation System*. King.
 LYTTELTON. *The Corner Stone of Education*. Putnam.
 MASON. *Home Education*. Kegan Paul.
 COIT. *Neighbourhood Guilds*. Swan Sonnenschein.
 UNWIN. *Garden Cities*. Fisher Unwin.
 PATERSON. *Across the Bridges*. Arnold.
 Housing and Town Planning Act, 1909. Wyman.

CHAPTER IX

AFTERWARDS

THE INDUSTRIAL SYSTEM—based on Competition—commonly regarded as a Necessary Evil—(Darwinism falsely applied here) but

IT IS NOT UNALTERABLE—Co-operation, though covering a very small proportion of our Industry, yet shows that the Competitive Principle is not the only workable one.

THE ROOT CAUSES of the Evils of the System are not Economic, but Moral and Psychological.

OUTLINE OF ARGUMENT JUSTIFYING THE ABOVE STATEMENT—

1. From the Point of View of Worker.
2. " " " Employer.

THE CURE depends on Educational Reform even more than on Economic Change. Moreover,

THE SYSTEM is in fact being altered (Conscious Selection superseding Natural Selection)—

1. By Industrial Legislation, controlling Conditions of Employment.
2. By Voluntary Enterprise, ameliorating Conditions outside.

THESE TWO METHODS are more and more being fused, *e.g.* Care Committees, Juvenile Advisory Committees.

RELATION OF THE STATE TO THE VOLUNTARY WORKER.

THE EFFORTS OF BOTH NOW CONCENTRATED ON THE EDUCATIONAL ISSUE.

The Continuation School in Germany and in England.

IN THE PRINCIPLES underlying both systems the permanent ideals of Humanism are reasserted. The Five Bridges again.

CHAPTER IX

AFTERWARDS

"When the school introduces and trains each child of society into membership, saturating him with the spirit of service, and providing him with the instruments of effective self-direction, we shall have the deepest and best guarantee of a larger society which is worthy, lovely, and harmonious."—DEWEY.

AND when the school has done its best?

Afterwards, and probably without a day's intermission, the child of fourteen is absorbed into the Industrial System. It is said that "what a man is trained for, that he will do."

We have been pleading throughout for a schooling that shall be in living relation to the after-life. It is time now for a candid, steady view of the system by which that life is mainly determined. Its sinews are capital, its backbone is machinery combined in varying proportions with unskilled labour, its life-blood is competition. The working of the system, often so curiously resembling the working of blind, inevitable forces, is in truth the working of the competitive principle in human minds. To this principle are due the cyclical trade fluctuations which are to the victims of them as mysterious and as inevitable as the tides. They hope for the "boom," and enjoy it when it comes, as they hope for and enjoy the sun. When, once in every decade, a trade depression bears down on

them, they endure it or sink under it as they endure or sink under a pestilence—and with as little foresight. If they seek a cause, they find it readily in the greed of the employer—not unreasonably, if the cutting down of wages coincides with the purchase of the third motor-car. But if, as often, the employer too is obviously sharing in the struggle for existence, then, and with equal reason, the blame falls on “the system.”

Again, a wider but not much more thoughtful public opinion, that of the onlookers,¹ tends more and more to attribute to the competitive system, rather than to the wrongdoing of individuals, these phenomena of trade cycles and all the concurrent ills—the speeding-up of piecework, the cutting down of wages, the ill-regulated overtime and slack time, and the logical absurdity by which, in bad times, overproduction² increases together with inability to purchase the very goods produced. It seems unreasonable that just when boots are a slump in the market, the makers of them should go unshod. But the system is not regarded as good or as reasonable, only as inevitable. Public opinion regrets it and condemns, but counts it the price of efficiency. It believes, half indolently and half humbly, that all the experts say so, that Darwin

¹ A relative expression, since none of us are really outside the system, or mere onlookers.

² Again relative. “Overproduction” at these times is not absolute, but relative to the price at which the market can be cleared. The result is a cutting down of prices, for which the manufacturer seeks to compensate by still greater output; then again overproduction, even at the lower price, to be met either in the same way, or by the reduction of output, involving dismissal of workers, and reduced purchasing power of another section of the community.

says so, and that it is all in the necessary course of evolution, even when it involves revolution.

It is well for public opinion to realise that many are gravely questioning whether a system so alien to logic and so detrimental to life is worth preserving; that even expert opinion is divided on the matter; that Political Economy is even now revising its root principles, and its very definition of "utility" in recognition of the steady encroachment of ethical ideas into its own domain. "A great many people," says Professor Smart,¹ "and these not the worst economists—think that the economic field may justly be regarded, not as a battle, but as a harvest field, where the greatest results are to be had, not by fighting against, but by working with each other. . . . In justice to the practical man, it must be said that he ridicules all this mainly because he does not understand that it is a new point of view—the subordination of the economic to the higher life. . . ."

But the new point of view is here, and to be reckoned with, since it has come to stay. Competition is not alone in the field, even though its chief rival, Co-operation, at present embraces only a small portion of our industry. In York the proportion of co-operative industry (distributive) is nearly one-tenth of the whole, and this figure, obtained from a small area which has given definite trial to the principle, is probably more significant than that which gives the general average. Still more significant is the *rate of increase* in Co-operative industry—from a membership of 438 (in

¹ Adam Smith, Professor of Political Economy in the University of Glasgow. See *Theory of Value*, p. 57, note.

York) to 7250 in twelve years¹—and also such new enterprises as the proposed Co-operative College for Manchester—"the beginning of a new era in co-operative education."²

It may be conceded, however, that while the proportion of co-operative labour is still so small, it is less unreasonable to work for amelioration within the competitive system than for the abolition of the system itself, the principles and motive of reform being in either case identical.

We have been meeting shallow objections with shallow answers. We are seeking to discredit the prevailing belief that the industrial system in its present form is a thing permanent and immutable. But it is from a deeper inquiry, when time and insight have sufficed for it, that higher and more rational hopes arise. And it is the glory of the educationist to see, beneath the economic causes which in all their complexity make up the social problem, other simpler and mightier forces at work—forces which are his to control through the teachers of the nation, if they too will see and believe.

The contention can only be briefly outlined here. It is believed that it will stand the test of fuller inquiry. Our thesis is—

That the root causes and the root cures of social evils are educational rather than economic.

And our argument is as follows—

1. The problem of poverty centres, by common consent, on unemployment.

¹ Rowntree, *Poverty*.

² *Manchester Guardian*, March 6, 1914.

2. The unemployment problem centres on the casual worker.
3. He is a casual either by choice or of necessity—through want of skill, or want of will, or want of health.
4. In either case he is an educational failure—on the side of knowledge, or adaptability, or physical training.
5. Casual labour is in the main unskilled labour. It is for education to reduce the supply of unskilled labour, which at present is vastly in excess of the demand. (In Munich, through the Continuation School, all except eight per cent. of the boys and girls leaving the Elementary Schools are taught a trade. In England at least fifty per cent.¹ go into unskilled work.)
6. So far as unskilled labour is required, its conditions will be improved by the fact of the reduced supply.
7. Unskilled labour, when the supply is in proportion to a real demand, need not be casual labour. This fact is sufficiently established by the recent organisation of London and Liverpool Dock Labourers.
8. *But*—improved conditions of unskilled labour can only benefit workers of a certain level of character and capacity. Below this level, high wages and reduced hours of work are even detrimental. Therefore the value of economic reform depends on educational reform.

¹ See Chap. III, and note on p. 65.

9. For *skilled workers*, so far as seasonal and cyclical fluctuations are beyond control, unemployment can best be met by the dovetailing of trades, so that a man may practice at least two seasonal trades. This is a matter for educational reform, both in the matter of general adaptability and of special skill.
10. A second remedy for seasonal workers is often sought in an increased wage, even for unskilled work, to cover the slack time. Again this is injurious to all, except those who are fitted by education to turn to good account not only wages beyond the immediate requirements, but also long spells of leisure.
11. So far the argument has been treated mainly from the side of the worker. From the employer's point of view it is urged that—

Economic interests are, in fact, served by educational reform. The most conclusive evidence hitherto (to be cited more fully at the end of this chapter) is from Germany, where the Continuation School System "is proving that the interests of employers are not inimical to those of educationists."¹
12. Just so far as economic crises are caused by deliberate or ignorant anti-social action on the part of Capitalists or Employers, the fact points to educational failure on another side—to the absence of civic and social training in our Schools and Colleges and Universities.²

¹ *Times Educational Supplement*, April 7, 1914.

² See *Social Responsibilities—Lectures to Business Men*, by Henry Jones, p. 48.

Such anti-social action, though not always readily assignable to definite individuals, is, nevertheless, an obvious and a potent factor in, for example, the general shaking of the credit system at the first slight symptoms of a "depression." We know that, at such times, panic creates the very evil that it fears. Simply through the panic, and not through the supposed economic cause, individuals and Firms are involved in a ruin which could have been wholly averted by a steady regard for the general interest. Or again, it is seen in the deliberate creation of an artificial demand, in the ousting of one employer or tradesman by another, not by means of a more efficient meeting of a real demand, but by means of superior skill or more lavish outlay in advertising. This radical difference between real and artificial demand was inadequately recognised by the older Economists. It is now increasingly evident that here, too, economic and moral law do not clash but confirm each other. The right relation of supply and demand is only guaranteed by the steady maintenance of a real demand—*i. e.* a demand for things whose relation to life is permanent and vital, not casual and capricious. And the evil of oversupply is best met by the steady increase of such a real demand over an ever widening area. Thus once more we are brought back to our starting-point. It is just such a demand that a Humanist education promotes, and it is just such a widening of the area that is entrusted to the Humanist education of our own day.

The outline has been bare and dogmatic. But, so far from claiming originality, it rather claims acceptance as being the plain, concentrated product

of the thinking of many experts, both in economics and education. Those who do accept it in essentials may once for all rid themselves of that fatalistic view of industrialism which regards it as one of the "blind forces," whether of nature or of human nature. They may substitute for this view a more hopeful and more rational theory that what human forces have marred human forces may mend, and that, if there be anywhere this "inevitable" working of evolution, it is to be found in the steady surrender of Natural Selection to the later and greater forces of Conscious Selection. They will look to educational reform for economic prosperity. - The more scientific their view, the stronger their theoretic denial that the industrial system is unalterable.

And the facts? The facts, before our eyes, prove that the system is being altered. There is no possible disowning of the argument as mere speculation. Already legislation and voluntary enterprise have so far transfigured "the system" that its earlier manifestations, albeit not more than a century removed from us, are only to be found in printed records, where they may be read as ancient archives, scarcely to be credited for very strangeness and for very badness. What "the system" meant, so long as it evolved as a blind force, can be sufficiently seen at the end of the first quarter of the nineteenth century. Since then, ninety years of conscious human enterprise have not only arrested certain "natural" developments of the struggle for existence (*e. g.* the employment of child labour), but have evoked countless other enterprises seemingly in direct conflict with the laws of that

struggle. The multifarious remedial measures by which, especially in England, we cushion the wall for the weak, are often condemned on this very ground, that by preservation of the unfit we are hindering evolution—nature's grim way of bettering the race. It would be truer to say that these attempts at cure are the necessary preliminary to all attempts at prevention. Certainly the record of nineteenth century legislation bears this out, dealing as it does with one acute symptom after another, until, in very weariness, it stumbles on the 1870 Education Act, and bequeaths to the succeeding centuries its death-bed discovery that prevention is better than cure.

But from 1825, when the first Factory Act of importance limited to sixty-nine the weekly working hours of a child of nine, the industrial system was subjected to a steady and increasing interference by means of legislation. Factory Acts rose on stepping-stones of their dead selves; Acts concerning Public Health, Housing, Land, the Franchise, relations of Masters and Men, Truck, rights of Combination, Banking and Joint Stock—all these gave deliberate pause to the previous methods of Industrialism. Thus the nineteenth century seemed to invade the very heart and fortress of the system, the factory itself, as well as its outworks, the homes of the employees. Twentieth century legislation, in true sequence, is occupying more and more of the outlying ground, and, most conspicuously, is concentrating on the rescue and the reclamation of the territory of the children. The century was heralded by the Children's Act and the establishment of Labour Exchanges with special provision for

Juveniles. While this chapter is being written,¹ the new Act for the better care of the Mentally Deficient is in the first weeks of operation, the new Budget has assigned an additional half-million to Education, and various towns are busy in the making of bye-laws under the Employment of Children Act.² These things are in the immediate foreground; in the near future is the "National System of Education," which Lord Haldane has foreshadowed; and on the horizon the slow but sure advance, towards the region of legislation and "practical politics," of such eugenist principles as shall finally emancipate us from the shadow of the older Darwinism into the daylight of its fuller teaching—from the blind working of Natural Selection into the helpful working of Conscious Selection; from the crude and cruel struggle for individual existence into the corporate and co-operative effort for enlightened life.

Thus far (and how much farther?) the scope of activity of the first force—legislation—in arresting the detrimental working of industrialism. The second—voluntary effort together with the raising of public opinion—is very variously estimated, some placing it high above the former, since legislation that is in advance of the general will of the community is either impossible or futile, others disparaging all volunteer work because of its too familiar blemishes—its littleness of scope, its frivolity, its unskilfulness, its waste. Instead of

¹ April 1914.

² And in the continuous expansion of Municipal enterprise in such matters as Milk Depots, Play Hours, Infant Consultations, School Clinics, After Care. For this is "the Century of the Child."

attempting the impossible—to sum up the relative worth of the two forces—let us rather take note of the tendency of our own day—a *new* tendency and one most full of hope—to combine them both, to concentrate, for one and the same social object, and in one single scheme, the agencies both of the State and the volunteer. The fusion of the two agencies, on a great scale and for wide-reaching action, has been made possible by many small beginnings in co-operative work—*e.g.* by the services of the Charity Organisation Society on Parliamentary Commissions, such as those on Vagrancy or Blindness, and by the express interest of Parliament in such organised volunteer work as that of the Guild of Help.¹ In regard to our more immediate concern, the welfare of children and juveniles, so far as the action of the two forces can be separately defined, it may be said that legislation can and does impose definite restrictions on the employment of children and juveniles in factories and shops, and definite requirements concerning their education in school; but that elsewhere, and in the home, its action is limited to emergency cases. Voluntary enterprise, empowered by the State, makes further provision to a quite indefinite extent, for the safeguarding of their interests, in and out of school, in and out of work, at home and abroad.

And the fusion of the two forces is nowhere better exhibited than in the voluntary After-Care work organised now in all our chief towns, controlled either by the Board of Trade, or by the Board of Education, or as in Birmingham, by the joint action of both these. State officials regulate

¹ See Report.

the work; legislation¹ makes it possible; but the "striking force" is the body of Voluntary Helpers, working in District Committees, and undertaking the responsibility for the well-being (industrial and general) of all boys and girls for the first three years after leaving the Elementary School. Partly because the scheme will be familiar to many readers, partly because its definite description is impossible within the limits of this chapter (though nothing is more relevant to the general purpose), further details of After-Care work shall be relegated to an Appendix. But three things shall be said at once. The scheme has already marvellously helped to elucidate for the volunteer the tangled web of social work, providing at once a reasonable and comprehensive plan of service for every available Helper, together with expert training and advice according to their need. As for "available Helpers," while the help of every section of the community is needed for this work, it is obvious that the most welcome and the most efficient help of all is that of the teachers. Then, for more than half a million boys and girls who leave the Elementary Schools each year, the scheme does expressly and deliberately seek to provide and preserve those very conditions of well-being, physical, mental and moral, which a Humanist Education demands not only for school days but for the "Afterwards." Thirdly, for the employers of juvenile labour, the standard of the work and its condition is, in the deliberate opinion of experts, being forced up by the combined pressure of the Labour Exchange and the Helpers. This is not

¹ The Education (Choice of Employment) Act, 1910, and the Juvenile Employment Act.

through any direct interference or censure, but simply through the fact that those Firms which fall below the standard find both the quality and quantity of their supply of labour reduced.

We turn now to another modern development, in which State-interference in industry seems to be forestalled or supplemented, not by the voluntary enterprise of amateur outsiders, but by the action of employers themselves. This is the system of Welfare Work, already fully organised in a few large factories, and likely to extend till it becomes something of a test-feature in all first-rank industry. At present, while so many of our social reforms are still in embryo, or at most in the nursery, it is not easy to see how they will adjust themselves to one another—how, for instance, the paid Welfare Worker of the factory will be co-ordinated with the voluntary After-Care Helper. What does, in fact, emerge, in a town where both are at work, is that the latter, through the Juvenile Labour Exchange and otherwise, encourages application to the Firm which employs Welfare Workers, helps the applicants to reach the necessary standard of health, cleanliness and scholarship, and then, having thus provided for the great majority of the fit and efficient, concentrates on the less fit and the inefficient, and on the conditions prevailing in the inferior industries by which these are of necessity absorbed. Such a division of labour seems reasonable in theory and is found workable in practice.

Is this too light a dismissal of a universal problem—the relation of the state to the volunteer in social enterprise? The problem has been admitted, and

its further complication recognised in the fact, however welcome, that the employer himself is in certain instances at once the most efficient volunteer and the most enlightened legislator in his own domain. But surely the dominant fact emerging out of the situation is just this—that the efforts of good employers, of skilled voluntary workers, and of right legislation are all aiming in one direction—that the chosen line of advance is essentially in every case identical. The writer at least is persuaded that the difficulty of adjustment, like the religious difficulty in schools, looms large in theory, and in the minds of all, *except those who have to meet it in practice*. For the Teacher and the Social Worker are foredoomed failures, both of them, whether paid or unpaid, official or volunteer, unless they work in a spirit of freedom. And if they do so work, it is of little moment to them whether their livelihood falls to them by way of their work or apart from it. They will render the same social service, whether as paid Welfare Worker or Voluntary Helper, and in the same spirit.

But it is of great moment to the community that the pathway of such service shall be open to all who desire it—be it noted, a continually increasing number—and who are qualified for it; and that by a more generous provision of training through Settlements and Schools of Social Study this second condition may be met. The need is for disinterested work and for skilled work. Those who are careful for these things will be careless whether it is the State or the volunteer or the employer who contributes them.

A writer who inclines strongly to a great increase

of State-action (Mr. Bray¹) would still leave to the volunteer the following spheres of service: first, all experimental and pioneer work in social reform—the successful efforts to be taken over by the State, the failures presumably to be left on his own shoulders. If this seems a little discouraging to voluntary effort, it is perhaps true enough to the facts. Out of voluntary Apprenticeship Committees have risen Juvenile Labour Exchanges; out of a Voluntary School system arose the 1870 Act. Perhaps it is the best that the volunteer can desire, and there is no doubt that the self-effacement of a John the Baptist is his best moral equipment. But besides this experimental work Mr. Bray concedes to him the task of collecting evidence (again for use in legislative measures) and the general work of home-visiting. This last, it will be admitted by all who know it, is a sufficiently wide and difficult field. Sir John Gorst² regards it as the chief means of solving the problem of parental responsibility in matters, for instance, such as free meals or free medical treatment for necessitous children. But in practice this partition of duties suggested by Mr. Bray is already superseded in the cases referred to above, where paid Welfare Workers are exercising the same “personal touch” in this very work of home-visiting. The one outstanding fact is the need of far more skilled workers of the same kind, paid or unpaid.

We turn to another great enterprise in the same crusade. More and more does the After-Care of our juveniles tend to concentrate on one problem—

¹ See *The Town Child*.

² See *The Children of the Nation*.

our own problem in particular—the possibility of their continued education. And of all the transforming forces at work upon the Industrial System at home and abroad, rendering the prospect of “Afterwards” an infinitely brighter and better one, probably the chief is the Continuation School. While we in Britain await a comprehensive and unified system such as Germany has long since secured, to her great gain,¹ there already exist among us sufficient experiments on a small scale to pave the way for greater. The Glasgow Evening Classes are compulsory for all who fail to “qualify” before leaving school, whereas in England a child, though he may be only in the Third Standard, is free to make an end of his “education” on his fourteenth birthday. As for our voluntary Evening Schools, they are waging everywhere the same uphill fight, contending with difficulties so great that experts are now discouraging the effort. It is heroic, but it is misdirected. Just where the need is greatest, there the difficulties are insuperable. There remains—seriously, does anything else remain to meet the necessity of the case?—the Day Continuation School, or the extended leaving age. The Evening School, adding two hours of mental strain to a nine hours working day for a child of fourteen, stands condemned, at least so soon as a better alternative is available.

It is those who best know the obstacles in the way both of employers and of parents, who best

¹ The German system is compulsory. But Dr. Kerschensteiner explicitly regards this as a temporary condition of success, and looks forward to a voluntary Continuation School. The rapid increase in attendance beyond the compulsory period seems to justify his view. See *The Schools and the Nation*, p. 170.

understand the otherwise intolerable slowness with which English opinion and English legislation move towards either of the above alternatives. We know now that it is "only a matter of time"; but "only" is a strange word in the face of the evil that accumulates for us with every year's delay. Of the two alternatives, neither can be adequately discussed here, but since the leaving age will only be extended very gradually, it is more worth while to give such brief notice as is possible to the Continuation School, which appears in any case to be obligatory. Also the right principle of the Continuation School, if it can be found, is probably the right principle for any extended course in the ordinary school.

What is that right principle?

We are confronted at once by the "vocational" ideal and that which seems to be its opposite. Some would have us glorify, by the Continuation School, the actual trade in which the child is engaged—it may be a butcher's—both by setting it in its true relation to the whole civic and national life, and by exalting the standard of skill and industry required. Others would have us use the Continuation School from the opposite point of view, to divert the interest and ability of the learner from his own narrow "shop," into "fresh fields and pastures new."

Once more the antagonism of the two ideals is only partial. Both have their place in the complete idea of life, where the best specialist is also the man of widest vision. And in practice neither ideal reigns exclusively, though Munich and the Central Schools of London stand conspicuously for the

vocational ideal, and the Trade Preparatory Schools of London (as contrasted with the Trade Schools) for the other. The deliberate union of both, under a genuinely Humanist ideal, is seen in the Crefeld Continuation Schools, which aim at a three-fold provision for the interests of boys between the ages of fourteen and eighteen, as individuals, as members of a trade and as citizens. Crefeld seems to give the most explicit recognition to the full Humanist ideal, so that the scholar "is not merely trained for life, but actually lives while he is in the school." But in Munich the same ideal would seem to be implicit, and is, in fact, contained in Dr. Kerschesteiner's wide interpretation of "vocation" for the Munich students. Both schemes conform to the recent dictum of Professor Bompas Smith on the matter of vocational training, that the economic ideal is included in the main ideal, and the industrial life is important and honoured, just because it is a vital part of the national life.

But we need not retrace our general theory of Humanism. It will be more useful, at the close, to summarise in a sentence the outstanding features of Continuation Schools in England and Germany, which, though with varying emphasis, yet agree in presenting the same five-fold plan. They are concentrating on the intelligent learning of a trade (thereby restoring the best elements of Apprenticeship), on physical efficiency, on the appreciation of good literature, on citizenship, and on social organisations for the enriching of leisure. In other words, the Continuation School, recognising that life is one, has set out to build with deliberate skill

those same Five Bridges with which we introduced our subject.

- I. Adaptability, through knowledge of *principles* as opposed to mechanical skill in *processes*.
- II. Care for health and physical training.
- III. Teaching of subjects, concentrated on the *Direct Values*.
- IV. Training of individuality through Citizenship.
- V. Provision for leisure time (through reading, help with hobbies, organised clubs, excursions, etc.).

“What a man is trained for”—the skilled performance of his own trade *and* the enlightened service of his country and his race—these things he will do.

FOR REFERENCE

- BEVERIDGE. *Unemployment*. Williams and Norgate.
 BLACK. *Sweated Industries*. Duckworth.
 BOSANQUET. *Poor Law Report of 1909*. Macmillan.
 FREEMAN. *Boy Life and Labour*. King.
 GIBBINS. *English Social Reformers*. Methuen.
 JONES. *Social Responsibilities*. Macle hose.
 SMART. *Theory of Value*. Macmillan.
 SMART. *Distribution of Income*. Macmillan.
 ROWNTREE. *Poverty*. Macmillan.
 KERSCHENSTEINER. *The Schools of the Nation*. Macmillan.
 KERSCHENSTEINER. *Education for Citizenship*. Macmillan.
 OGDEN AND BEST. *The Problem of the Continuation School*. King.
 COOLEY. *Some Continuation Schools of Europe*. Commercial Club of Chicago, 1912.
 BEST, DAVIES, AND PERKS. *Report of Berlin and Birmingham Brass-workers*. King.
 MACGREGOR. *Evolution of Industry*. Williams and Norgate.
 ALDEN. *Child Life and Labour*. Headley.
Report to the President of the Local Government Board on Guilds of Help in England. Wyman.

CHAPTER X

HUMANISM AND THE WAR

HUMANISM AND WAR.

HUMANISM AND THIS WAR—

The Humanist Alternatives.

The Humanist Responsibility.

PRESENT EFFECTS OF WAR ON EDUCATION—

- | | | |
|---------------|----------------------|----------------------------|
| (a) Finance. | (b) Buildings. | (c) Personnel. |
| (d) Teaching. | (e) Home Conditions. | (f) Industrial conditions. |

Summary of effects: (a) Present disorganisation; (b) Enlightenment; and from both these (c) Opportunity for Educational Reform, swifter and more drastic than would be otherwise possible.

THE EDUCATIONAL ISSUE—

Mass Conformity as opposed to Social Individuality.

NEED OF AN EMERGENCY SCHEME, starting from the Training Colleges.

THE OPPOSING FORCES—

1. Against Humanism.
2. For Humanism.

CHAPTER X

HUMANISM AND THE WAR

"Nothing but education can rescue us from all the miseries which overwhelm us"—FICHTE.

"So began contention to give delight and be excellent in things aimed to make life kind."—GEORGE MEREDITH.

AT this time waste of words, as waste of every kind, is the unpardonable sin. We are witnessing what seems waste beyond repair—beyond imagining in extensity, for our minds would not contain the significance of a true record, even if it were available, and beyond imagining in intensity, seeing that it is life at its best and greatest that is being poured out, and the most dear achievements of humanity, the old and the new, that are being obliterated or frustrated. There must be no waste of words. Yet there must be some testing of all educational theory, and of the foregoing pages, in the face of sudden and utter change.

We of the teaching fellowship find ourselves in one of two camps, and for us there is no third. We may take the extreme pacifist position, the most logical if the most difficult, and exert our utmost strength and patriotism in peace-propaganda and peace-preparations. Or we may take the more generally accredited position of those who maintain

the "war to end war" paradox. To restate the alternatives, we may decide that when peaceful settlement failed, the European conflict was for us the call to witness to our peace-policy even by martyrdom, and a martyrdom of other nations with our own, but not to deviate from that policy. Or we may subscribe to the thoughtful and deliberate declaration of our leading English men of letters, philosophers and scientists, that in this instance peace, progress, and freedom do utterly depend on the sword. But as Humanists we cannot defend militarism, and we cannot stand for any tribal or purely national ideal. Against the German claim of a Teuton world-autocracy, imposing Teuton culture on the nations, we oppose the counter-claim not of Anglo-Saxon autocracy,¹ but of international liberty. If Humanism be a true thing, there is for the teacher or the educator no third alternative beyond the two just stated, nor any acquiescence in any such that may seem to arise later as the result of the present conflict, *e. g.* in the prolongation of huge armaments which have now demonstrated their failure to avert war, or of a foreign policy which is excluded from democratic control. Politically, Humanism can only lead to international federation on an ever-increasing scale, to a progressive realisation for each nation, as for each member of it, of the ideal of social individuality, and to a democratic control increasing in thoroughness with every year of democratic education. Meanwhile, it is for the Humanist, pre-

¹ Though Lord Rosebery did unfortunately make such a counter-claim (carefully noted by Bernhardt in *Germany and the Next War*, Chap. I.), the sentiment was utterly un-English.

eminently, to estimate with juster knowledge than that of other men the present loss, to suffer more acutely in the knowledge, and to labour more fervently and more discerningly for a right reconstruction. If he be differentiated in anything from other men, it is by a stronger faith in the worth of human life and human achievement. He cares for the manuscripts of Louvain. He cares not less for the broken career of the college youth or the engineer's apprentice or the factory hand. He sees his educational ideal shattered by artillery, whether it is a cathedral that is torn, or the limbs of men. For him the injury, every way, is infinitely beyond the scope of reasoned protest or sentimental outcry. A war such as this is for him bitter and boundless loss.

But it is also his shame. As an educator he is bound to ask himself, just as the Christian is bound to ask himself, how this thing could be, and why, many centuries after the world's enlightenment through an emancipated religion and a liberated knowledge, the principles of both of these have failed to avert a world-disaster. The Humanist, like the Christian, has laid upon himself heavy responsibility, just by his profession of faith—by his belief in an education which shall rescue men and nations from the waste of physical combat, and guide them to high issues of co-operative achievement. Moreover, the democratic extension of Humanism, within the nation and beyond the nation, is, as we have seen, the peculiar obligation of this present age—of this generation, whose democracies are still held, with too much reason, to be incompetent for any share in international

politics, but whose governments must for ever be answerable for the most deadly of the world's wars.

To what purpose, then, have we been educating? It is imperative that we should know where to locate the educational failure. Does it lie in the general anti-Humanist conservatism and apathy which have brooded so long over great educational areas? Or does it lie in a definitely anti-Humanist activity, moving, but moving right athwart the Humanist tradition, to the negation of freedom and the narrowing of human relationships? There is plain evidence of both these things—in England mainly of the first, in Germany mainly of the second. Together they have defeated, at the crisis, the living forces of a new Humanism that were even now springing up with promise of a harvest of enriched human life such as the world has never yet reaped. To students of social and educational questions—still more to practical workers in both domains—the peculiar tragedy of this war is the narrow margin of time by which it was made possible. To them, using their special evidence, it seems a reasonable conjecture that even a ten years' delay would have averted it for ever. Their evidence is drawn, not from the relative strength of things as they are, but from the direction in which they are moving. They attach less importance to inert masses of unthinking prejudice, in every class, than to certain new forms of active life, small as yet, and unrecognised often by the world, but numerous, and more full of significance for the future than all the slumbering or backward-gazing hosts that know no conflict save in the

crudest and least honoured form of war, and no struggle for existence that is not material. In the early summer of 1914 it was possible to believe that more of future destiny lay with the party of a hundred English Adult School members who received German hospitality in Berlin and Hamburg, and should have repaid it in kind the next year, or, again, with the interchanging groups of German and English schoolboys, than with any military bureaucracy. For new life is stronger and more significant than old. But new life can be crushed by lifeless weight. It is at any rate the tragedy and the guilt of Humanism that its new life was still too backward and too weak to save Europe.

From the general consideration of a Humanist's position in face of this war we turn to its definite and immediate effects on Education. For we need to know where the injury falls, and whether there is any compensating gain, and whether schemes of advance that were clear and reasonable in June 1914 are now worth so much as a discussion.

First, the financial stringency means that where educational progress depends on large Government grants it is almost certainly delayed, unless there is a deliberate reconsideration of the relative worth of such expenditure. The outlook here is very dark, seeing that for the Elementary School the conclusion has been drawn at every point of the discussion that the realisation of Humanism depends on small classes and a proportionately increased Staff. Yet we may remember Denmark, whose national regeneration through the People's High Schools took place in years of such dire

poverty that the insufficiency of meal was eked out with the bark of trees. Money is an indispensable condition for our own educational reformation; but the will of the people to be educated is a stronger factor yet. If that will is not called out by our present system, we may do well to compare the system with that which has incarnated the national will of Denmark. Financial stress at this time may be great. But if the gigantic war-expenditure—estimated by Chiozza Money in November 1914 at a minimum of £600,000,000—convinces us of the difficulty of pressing any other claims at this time, it may also convince us with startling force of the paltry nature of our normal expenditure on Education, and of the flagrant untruthfulness of the plea that some £30,000,000 in grants and rates was the utmost limit of a reasonable demand. £30,000,000, it now appears, is less than the cost of one month's warfare.

Secondly, in many places School or University buildings have been taken over by the War Office, to the serious disturbance and hindrance of Education. If this was inevitable we may nevertheless be glad that it met with protest from those who regarded it as an underrating of the importance to the State of all educational gain or loss.

Thirdly, the Staff of every University and every Boys' School is modified, and in most cases weakened, by the absence of men at the front or in training, and the presence of men who only obtained their present position owing to the dearth created by the war. The educational loss incurred in cases where women are not eligible needs no comment, especially, if the prevailing sentiment is

that lately expressed by a woman teacher: "Teaching is no proper man's work now."

Fourthly, whatever be the intention of the teacher, no teaching given at this time can be unaffected by the world-happenings. If these are ignored—and the extent to which such ignoring is possible would only be credited by an eye-and-ear-witness—the result must be to render the work of the school infinitely more remote from vital interest and from Humanist value. If they are dealt with as the Minister of Education has most seriously requested every teacher to deal with them,¹ they furnish an obligation and an opportunity which all must welcome who count themselves, in the words of that appeal, "trustees for posterity," as well as for the seven million pupils and students with whom the Board deals. Never was a greater need for a true appreciation of values, for a clear discerning of fine and foul elements in war, for a widened horizon, for a bridging of class and race distinctions, for co-operation in service and sacrifice, for the banishing of futilities. And if the demand for all this is universal, it is emphatically the work of teachers to see that it reaches, in some fit and reasonable form, the seven million scholars, "so that in the full vigour of a national spirit they may hereafter become workers for the concord of nations and lay the foundations of enduring peace."² To forestall an obvious criticism, it must be added that nothing is further from the purpose of the appeal, or of this chapter, than the disturb-

¹ Letter from Mr. J. A. Pease "to my colleagues in the National Service of Education."

² *Idem, ibid.*

ance of school order by a noisy and insincere exhibition of "patriotism." All "demonstrations" may well be omitted, at least by the schools. The appeal is for a new depth and meaning in ordinary duties and lessons, together with a deliberate and steady facing (under guidance, and with a quickened sense of comradeship) of a changed national life and a new and great and terrible chapter in the world's history. Nothing is gained by panic, and nothing is gained by ignoring. The Schools can largely prevent both. The facts and the effects of the war have already struck right into the lives and homes of school children. The only question is whether they strike upon prepared or unprepared minds. It is difficult to see how any teacher can evade this responsibility, or dismiss the letter of the Education Secretary as irrelevant.

Fifthly, in the Elementary Schools the home circumstances of very many children are greatly affected—not always for the worse—by the war. There is therefore every justification for the appeal to teachers to carry their work outside the school and assist in the organising of relief. Those who do not accept the general claim, already made in the name of Humanism, for such extended service may yet accept the special claim of emergency.

Lastly, from this effect on home conditions we cannot separate the industrial effect, the wholesale dislocation of employment, rendering more acute the need for a genuine system of After-Care. We have urged in the previous chapter, and need only repeat with added emphasis, that no body of Helpers can so adequately furnish and maintain such a system as the Elementary Teachers.

Gathered together, these results might seem

summed up for Education in a single word, disorganisation. But, like all negatives, that word is only a half-truth, and the least significant half. The positive fact, behind the disorganisation, is a general enlightenment—chiefly as to what is superfluous in life and what is necessary. Artificial conditions of industry give place to simpler operations of the law of supply and demand—though the transition itself is not simple. Luxuries, and the trades that maintain them, take a more normal position in the scale of life, and in relation to other trades. State and voluntary agencies for social reform have never so thoroughly joined forces, and out of their combined experiments in an emergency period many must prove themselves of permanent worth and efficiency, thereby furthering and hastening an improved social order even while the war delays it. To give one obvious example, the various schemes for the leisure time of unemployed workers, or recruits on leave, or idle and excited girls—schemes beaten out now under stress of real social danger—may surely be consolidated into lasting organisations for the safeguarding and enriching of the people's leisure in time of peace. The double reproach has been with us all along, that we neither educate the great majority to the point of using leisure with freedom, with resource and with self-control, nor provide adequate assistance and supervision for those by whom leisure can only be, otherwise, abused. This reproach, in regard to the recruits, has lately been laid at the door of the Education Department.¹ With justice

¹ On the other hand, the proposal of the Education Secretary to organise a scheme of educational lectures for recruits was rejected by the War Office.

it might have been laid there long since, in regard to a far greater company of adults and children. But it is only now, with the flashlight of national peril thrown upon it, that this educational failure has been forced upon the public notice. In our whole social order, disorganisation has brought enlightenment.

In the Schools let us hope for the same result at a lesser cost. The disorganisation is serious enough, though less than in the industrial world. But the chance of enlightenment is greater. There is the same call to discriminate between essentials and trifles, and to deal only with realities. Not one page of history, literature or geography need be irrelevant or lifeless to-day. Yet in October 1914 a Seventh Standard, not having had so much as a single lesson on the war, is mechanically learning the products and the Constitution of Cuba, and Hayti, while apparently not a single avenue of practical service has been found for this school. But it may well be that the indifferent schools are far outnumbered by those who have turned to splendid account the present opportunity of patriotism, both in teaching and in corporate service. It is an opportunity, from the School's point of view, which cannot be overrated. The material help available from the children of the poor may be insignificant—though one might wish that the weekly needlework lesson of some millions of girls had been definitely called into the service of the nation at this time. But the chief gain in question is the gain to the Schools. It is the occasion, for such as needed it, for a sudden change of outlook and a sudden revelation of the meaning and the

worth—so fatally obscured by our system—of all voluntary service rendered to one's neighbour or the nation. To-day, if not on any yesterday, Professor Dewey might hope for a hearing, when he asks for an education that not only includes but centres upon the idea of citizenship.

Disorganisation and enlightenment. These two together spell opportunity. Out of these two have arisen the greatest achievements in history. We may think of the year 480 B.C., or of 1453 A.D.—of the international peril and the spiritual awakening that resulted. And we may think, in the same sequence, of 1914. Nor can we, as Humanists, shrink from exalting our own educational problem to this level of international importance, since our whole faith rests on such an identification of issues, and it is not possible to deny that the problem of the schools is the problem of the nations.

This concluding chapter calls for one final re-statement of that problem as Humanism must conceive it to-day, and of the forces ranged on either side.

The issue is between the rival ideas of mass conformity and social individuality. Humanism stands for the full and free development of the individual in and through society. Humanism must war eternally upon all systems, political, social, or educational, which either suppress individuality by a one-sided or mutilated development, kill it by excess of routine, or distort it by the omission of social obligation and privilege. In every age Humanism has meant this conflict. In our own age it means it with peculiar intensity. It stands condemned in the present crisis, not for any error

of faith, but for laxity of fulfilment. A steady development of its principles in theory and practice in European countries must have resulted before this in an educated democracy; and an educated democracy must have produced international relations of such a character as to dispense finally with the *ultima ratio* of war. It is indeed said that the further education and the increased prosperity of the working classes may merely bring them to the militarist standpoint now held by many of their rulers, and that their peace policy may be laid aside in favour of reckless aggression. Here lies the supreme test. Of our present educational system, notably in many of the great Public Schools and throughout the Elementary School area, this thing is to be feared as the probable issue. Of German education it is already proved. Just so far neither of these systems is Humanist. Upon a Humanist foundation of social individuality and freedom no educational system can be maintained that stops short of international fellowship. The main value of each stage of widening interest is as a passport to the next. There is no question of sacrificing national individuality in the process. The interests and qualities of each nation are safeguarded and enhanced by the appreciation of different interests and different qualities in other nations. But by what conceivable logic can those who desire to transcend the limits of school and town refuse to transcend the limits of the nation? Yet at this hour the question is of no mere academic interest, but crucial. The illogical nationalist limit is emphatically decreed by Bernhardt's educational theory, and that theory is now being most faith-

fully demonstrated: "To expand the idea of the State into that of humanity, and thus to entrust apparently higher duties to the individual leads to error, since in a human race conceived as a whole, struggle and, by implication, the most essential vital principle would be ruled out. Any action in favour of collective humanity outside the limits of the State and nationality is impossible. Such conceptions belong to the wide domain of Utopias."¹

To which the Humanist, in victory or defeat, replies in the words of Socrates: "Whether there is or ever will be such a city matters not to him who desires to see it, for he will live according to the laws of that city and no other."

That is his necessary and final declaration. But he believes in the progressive realisation of Humanism, and on the score of reasonableness he certainly has little to fear at this moment from a comparison with the opposing ideal. His main concern now is the time-problem. There is need of haste, that not one more generation may needlessly, and, to its own irreparable loss, delay the realisation of Humanism. The path of Humanist education, as the only consistent path of progress, is bound to be stumbled upon soon or late. But the wastage by the way is tragedy enough. The Humanist believes not only in the possibility of general and steady advance, but in a quite peculiar opportunity for rapid advance at this moment—an opportunity provided by present disorganisation and enlightenment.

Is such a faith, after all, practical? Is the opportunity there, in fact as in theory?

¹ Bernhardi, *Germany and the Next War*.

It is, if we are prepared to face the emergency with emergency methods, and to face it at once. Comte's special programme, designed to win a first footing for Positivism, may at least suggest the immediate line of advance, and we have what he had not, an organisation ready for our use. We must begin with the rapid circulation of the principles of Twentieth Century Humanism, by means of lecture courses delivered in successively widening circuits—the first circuits to comprehend all the Training Colleges of the country, the later the whole teaching body. The demand is not for revolution. We have seen that the best Humanism is the oldest and the most often reiterated, though always new in application. The demand is for the new application, and for added impetus *now*, and for the immediate concentration of its full force upon the Training Colleges. It is necessary, and it is possible, that within one generation all Training Colleges should become what some already are—a sure vantage-ground for Humanist Education, whence the whole campaign may be unceasingly directed and reinforced. At present too many of them are themselves in bondage, either through old-fashioned excess of devotion to the knowledge-ideal or through new-fashioned excess of devotion to the cult of expression. Through both these causes, and through the intolerable haste of the normal two years' course, they are burdened with a curriculum which, despite its multifarious subjects, fails to achieve the breadth or the coherence or the vitality of Humanism, and misses too often that reverent yet familiar conversance with greatness which should be signified by "culture." While

they themselves exhibit want of balance, want of appreciation and want of freedom, we look to them in vain to transmit to our schools these essential qualities of Humanist education. And where else are we to look for this national service, in face of urgent need?

Even with a three years' course, we might urge with Dr. Kerschesteiner a reduction in the number of subjects, and a richer development of those which advance not only the professional power, but also the true individuality of each student. It is in this sense that Dr. Kerschesteiner desires the Training College, like the Continuation School, to be thoroughly vocational, concentrating first on the chosen life-work, which is of all life-works the most liberal and the most Humanist, and then on the special subject of individual choice, with a sufficient margin of time and energy for its true and thorough pursuit. Along this chosen line of study the student must realise that high standard of accuracy and of devotion which are at least as indispensable to "culture" as is a wide range. Thus he will take up his life-work equipped with a double enthusiasm—for his profession and for the subject-matter of his teaching. This, of course, points to a very sweeping reorganisation of our Elementary School system, to admit of a much greater use of the specialist. But the change need not be sudden or revolutionary, and the way is already prepared in a few subjects, such as Science and Manual Work. One Elementary School known to the writer has already adopted the specialist principle throughout. In this case, a mixed school of seven hundred, the Head Master agreed with the Staff to

make the experiment for a single year, with the result that all but one desired its prolongation for the following year, and after that the verdict was unanimously favourable.¹

To return to the Training College, one omission only in Dr. Kerschensteiner's proposed syllabus seems serious. The History of Education is not an integral part of the scheme. This is the subject which, above all, might with reason be made compulsory, just because it involves the recognition of the claims of all others, and of their relative importance in the view of the greatest educators; while, more than any study of the Science of Education, of Psychology and Ethics, it reveals and exalts the true character of the teacher's profession. Through sheer ignorance of the Humanist ideal in education, and of its eternal reassertion by the saviours of the race, students are leaving the Training Colleges even to-day with a contempt for their profession—a contempt which, after so profound an error at the outset, the subsequent school-experience is by no means sure of removing. Even to-day a Head Master is saying, "I would as soon put my son into the rag trade."

We are concentrating here upon the Training Colleges as chiefly responsible for the quality of teaching in the schools and for the attitude of teachers to their profession. But we are very far from limiting the responsibility to them. Until the prospects of teachers are greatly improved, in

¹ Specialist teaching in Religious Knowledge is definitely recommended by Mr. Murray (L.C.C. District Inspector). See Report of the Education Officer (L.C.C.) for 1908-1909, pp. 8-9. In regard to History and Geography it is already in use in the Demonstration School of one L.C.C. Training College.

regard to salary and promotion (to put the less critical points first), and still more in regard to conditions of work, size of classes, freedom of action, it is not really probable that there will be a sufficient supply of good teachers to maintain even the existing standard. We are told of an annual demand for 12,000 or 14,000, and a supply of 5000 or 6000.¹ And in the present year, owing to the shortage, external examiners are admitting to the ranks of qualified teachers even those students whom the Training College authorities have themselves refused to recommend—whose exclusion they have urged. It is a dilemma. Just those who are most fitted for the work, who best appreciate the meaning of their opportunity and responsibility, and most gravely realise what Humanism in 1915 ought to signify, are unable to accept the conditions of work in most Elementary Schools—the lack of liberty, the unwieldy classes, the mechanical methods. With such teachers the question of pay, however urgent, is not uppermost. But an Education Authority, local or central, which has any conception of the service to be rendered by an efficient and loyal teacher, will admit with Luther that “no money is sufficient to pay the debt you owe him”; and, having guaranteed by a reasonable salary the means for fruitful leisure, for enlightened interests and for continued education, will quickly satisfy the yet more urgent need of fair conditions of work within the school—by the removal of every needless restriction on individual liberty and by the reduction of big classes.

¹ *Times Educational Supplement*, May 5, 1914; and see Chap. I, p. 19, note.

When shall these things be? It is useless, in view of existing conditions, to prolong a merely theoretical advocacy of Humanist education. We have seen that against Humanism there are ranged mighty material obstacles, and spiritual obstacles yet more mighty. The removal of the former may make possible the removal of the latter, though they cannot ensure it. In the Elementary Schools the greatest material obstacles, dwelt upon with wearisome but needful persistence throughout these chapters, are the size of the classes and the early leaving age. Both these resolve themselves into questions of expense. And in the Training College we have found the problem which underlies all others—the calibre of the Teaching profession. This problem, too, is in part financial, depending for its solution on a prolonged and liberal training, and on a general uplifting of the teacher's career.¹ The writer is, however, unready to endorse a popular opinion which reduces the whole question to finance and the scale of salaries. Such a view is altogether untrue to the existing facts, unfair to the existing teachers, and unable to account for the vast divergency of merit, of calibre, of devotion, and of skill to be found under the present system. But we can admit that increased expenditure is an essential factor in reform, while denying that it is the sole condition. How long are we to be hindered by it? How long are we to grudge it?

"A city's increase," says Luther, "consists not

¹ A recent estimate of the increase in annual expenditure on education involved by a universal class limit of twenty and a minimum salary of £150 gives £55,000,000. (Letter by the Head Master of St. George's School, Harpenden, in *Times Educational Supplement*, January 1914.)

alone in heaping up great treasure, in building solid walls or stately houses, or in multiplying artillery and munitions of war; nay, where there is great store of this, and yet fools within it, it is all the worse and all the greater loss for the city: but this is the best and the richest increase, prosperity and strength of the city, that it shall contain a great number of polished, learned, intelligent, and honorable, and well-bred citizens; who when they have become all this, may then get wealth and put it to a good use."

The expense will only be met when not only the Government, but the nation, believes this—believes that right education is the soundest of investments; that, apart from all idealist schemes of social regeneration, money outlaid on the education of citizens repays itself inevitably in money saved from institutional treatment of the unfit; that at the present time a doubled educational expenditure would not only rapidly refund itself in this way, but would then, by promoting increased national efficiency, be the best guarantee for a continuous increase in the national income.

At present the nation does not believe any of this in any practical sense. Most serious of all is the fact that Local Educational Authorities do not believe it. How comes it that we are entrusting issues so tremendous to men who have had no opportunity for even grasping their significance? How comes it that we are committing so large a measure of educational control to those who have never studied education, while we withhold the control from those who have made it their life-work? The personnel of an Urban District

Education Committee was recently summed up by a Councillor as consisting of "publicans, jerry-builders, and retired shopkeepers." He added as an afterthought, "and ministers." And all too typical, and all too common, are the following expressions of individual opinion on the part of the Local Authority: "My education only cost me 19s. 3d., and it's good enough." "If 30s. is good enough for a working man, it's good enough for a teacher." The second remark was made by a member of the Committee which actually controlled the appointment of teachers. It is unjust, as well as futile, to upbraid these men for adhering to the only view which their own education has presented to them. But need we put into their hands the spiritual destiny of the next generation? There is everything to be said for a growing measure of public control of education, for the principle of devolution, and for extended municipal powers. There is nothing to be said for the elimination of the expert, for the present small proportion of co-opted members, and for the astoundingly insufficient representation of teachers, both Heads and Assistants. So long as the external control is thus divorced from the actual inner working of the system, and largely exercised by those who are indifferent to, because ignorant of, the highest educational interests, so long must those interests be sacrificed. And, to return to our materialist ground, so long must even a prudent economy be thwarted. Ignorance of the relative importance of various material conditions, as they actually affect the child and the teacher in school, is bound to be wasteful. Thousands of pounds, for instance, have

been spent on giving to school buildings a massive solidity and permanence which, in the modern view of experts, is not only needless, but actually undesirable, as hindering future developments. On the other hand, far too little importance is often attached to the question of street traffic, and the arch-evil of noise. Any teacher knows, and would urge if he had opportunity, that one lesson in a quiet room is worth five given under strain of competition with tram-cars and heavy drays. But he is not consulted, and the mistake once made is unalterable, because of expense. The money must not be wasted, so the nerve-tissue of teacher and child, for generations to come, must be wasted instead. There is no Rule of Three to bring this ratio home to the Authority.

One more general consideration may be urged in connection with buildings. We are not ignoring the tremendous difficulty and cost involved in the change to small classes. But in many cases there might be a practical advantage in advocating an even smaller number than thirty (this still to be the legal limit), whenever the structure allows a room built for sixty to be partitioned so as to provide for two classes of twenty or twenty-five. But, for the main increase in necessary expenditure, arising from salaries, the Local Authority must depend on a duly increased Government grant, accompanying the universal requirement of a class-limit of thirty, and a time-limit of fifteen years, if the London experiment does not justify a shorter one. Once more, to meet the inevitable outcry, we are maintaining that the economic argument is forced to identify itself with the educational

argument, for education is economy, though it is a great deal more besides. And every educational argument which justifies the class-limit of thirty for Secondary Schools applies, and with double force, to Elementary Schools. If the war has swallowed up vast sums of money, it has also revealed that those vast sums were available—that all the constructive work of educational and social reform, which we know to be the real safeguard against war, need not have been stunted and starved. Now, though the difficulty is greater, we are perhaps more ready to face it. The partial and indirect methods so far employed for reducing the class of sixty, by regulations concerning air-space, and by a graded scheme of the numbers who may be taught by Uncertificated, Supplementary and Student Teachers, have done their preliminary work. It is time for the great army of Certificated Teachers to be freed from this outstanding obstacle to their service, whatever the cost.

But even these great material obstacles are for Humanism not the greatest. The desired result depends also on a Humanist development in the Training Colleges. The inferior teacher of a class of twenty brings us no nearer Humanism than the efficient but thwarted teacher of a class of sixty. Thus do the material and spiritual obstacles act and react upon each other. And this more generous, more "liberal," training of teachers which we are demanding depends again upon increased expenditure, as well as upon the individual will of every student in the Colleges. The opportunity of such training once assured, together with reasonably consistent conditions of service afterwards, it

remains to require from the teacher a standard other than the present one—a genuine understanding of the Humanist purpose, and co-operation with it. If, in spite of wrong conditions of service and in spite of meagre training, there are even now to be found in the majority of schools individual teachers who generously meet this requirement, it is reasonable to believe that the double reform here demanded—a more liberal training and a class-limit of thirty¹—may even within one generation convert that minority into the accepted and prevailing type. As regards the big classes, the evidence of the younger teachers themselves is solid, if only it were brought into use. They find themselves forced into a daily surrender of their own educational principles and the best results of their training, by the simple fact of numbers. Perpetually teaching is sacrificed to “discipline,” and the interest of the majority to the coercion of the few. Mechanical treatment steadily encroaches on better methods, merely because it is found a safeguard to order. Moral values are hopelessly confused by the same conditions. Countless actions are “wrong” just because they are not uniform, and “goodness,” as Mme. Montessori protests, “is confounded with immobility.” The children of the poor, needing by force of circumstances far more individual care and training than those of Secondary Schools, are dealt with in a wholesale fashion from which the latter are expressly shielded by the class-limit of

¹ For the present. But though this may prove a safe limit for Secondary Schools, it is obviously too high for the more arduous requirements of the Elementary Schools in regard to individual training.

thirty. This is the just and obvious remonstrance of Elementary Teachers. Their chief blame is that they have not, as a Profession, given it clearer expression.

This brings us again to the central evil—the effect of the Elementary School system in narrowing or dulling the vision of those who administer it. There is too little desire for change. The machine imparts its own character to those who work it. Mechanism, repetition, uniformity—all the arch-foes of Humanism—find fit nourishment in the system. Again and again individual Humanist initiative beats itself upon it, and perishes. With rare exceptions it is still true that the young teacher taking up a first appointment finds every inducement to unprogressive uniformity, every risk in the path of original enterprise. For this great evil external reforms cannot ensure a remedy; they do nevertheless condition it. They can save the waste of good teachers. They can make straight the way for that Humanist renaissance which is even now waiting at our reluctant doors.

The issue for Humanism has been concentrated so far upon the Elementary Schools, because, once more, here lies the main challenge, and here lie the greatest obstacles. But our last survey must be a wider one. The Elementary Schools are not alone in their struggle, though they may well feel that the brunt of the battle is theirs. Elsewhere, in other types of Schools, in Universities, in Training Colleges, the same campaign is being fought against uniformity and mechanism. How hard is the conflict in our great Public Schools! Indeed, for sheer slavery to habit and fashion, and sheer worship of

mass-conformity, the Public School boy would be hard to beat. But why? Because for him it is mainly a great and honourable tradition that has so stereotyped the fashions, and a noble ideal on which the worship is founded. Rightly concentrating their gaze on the past glory, year by year in solemn celebration pledging anew their loyalty to the immortal dead—

“Let us now praise famous men, and our fathers that begat us,”

what wonder if, in these schools, each fresh generation is unwilling to admit defect in the Old Order, or obligation on their part to change it? Probably no modern foundation can duly appreciate the greatness of the difficulty. And at this hour what shall we say? For the glory of the Old Order is shining with peculiar radiance. At this hour these schools are adding, each one, new names to the Roll of Honour, new tablets in chapel or cloisters, inscribed with the names of their soldier-sons. With what just and solemn pride is this patriotism recorded! How often by individual heroism is the whole school exalted! How often is the hero, for his part, lifted to levels otherwise unknown by school-memories such as Newbolt has intertwined with the critical moments of battle or a lonely death!¹ What is it that we are asking? What is it that we censure in a tradition such as this? We ask for more, and not less, of such brave devotion to school and country. We ask for its liberation in more varied fields of service, and chiefly in the unvarnished service of municipal life. We know

¹ *e. g.* “Lampada Vitai” and “He fell among thieves.” Newbolt, *Collected Poems*.

that the deeper the patriotism the less need of varnish. We censure, not the recording of the patriotism of soldiers, but the oblivion of the patriotism of Town Councillors. And we hold that while "national service" is thus narrowly interpreted by them, our great Public Schools are meriting the sentence passed on them recently by one of their most faithful sons: "They are a great opportunity lost."

And of the Universities can the judgment be otherwise, as long as it is only the desperate trumpets of war that can be clearly and universally recognised as the summons to patriotism? The splendour of the response at this hour casts its backward reflection on the prevailing conception of duty at normal times.

These, then, are the forces ranged against Humanism—outer and inner forces of conservatism, mechanism, and mass-conformity, active in every department of education, and active, as we have seen, in the industrial world.¹ What can be said of the allies of Humanism?

We begin within the territory of the Schools themselves, though we shall not end there, and we begin with the earliest school age, though we must also look beyond it in both directions. In the modernised Infants' School Humanism is already a thing accomplished. The thing that marks off the already approved modern type from others is simply its acceptance of Humanism. The ideal of free and well-balanced growth, and the use of numbers to quicken individuality and not to suppress it—these things have reasserted themselves in the interests

¹ See Chaps. III and IX.

of the youngest of our scholars. The victory in this limited area is the best hope of victory in the wider. There is no need to separate, as is often done, the Montessori movement from this general reformation of the Infants' School. Without such general preparation the former could not conceivably have won its sudden and swift ascendancy. Mme. Montessori's work has been an extreme expression of Humanism in that direction where the way was most ready, and in those special aspects which concern Infant Education. Hence the emphasis on sense training *at this period*. If this were the full range of her theory, she would, for this lack of balance, forfeit her claim (as Seguin and Itard forfeit theirs) to rank among the great Humanists. But even greater than her scheme of Infant Education is her recognition of its place in the life-education of citizens, and its share in the regeneration of the whole social order. On this ground its justification is no longer merely theoretical. Thus a Montessori Teacher in England asserts that the very first thing to emerge clearly from the experiment in her school was a new co-operative and unselfish character in the children—"the making of citizens," as she termed it—just that quality, in fact, which the stress on individuality and on sense-training was held to imperil.

At the next stage, above the age of seven, Humanism faces the full force of opposition. Between the principles of the modernised Infants' School or Mme. Montessori and those of the older and still prevailing type of Elementary School there is no possibility of reconciliation. This cannot be too clearly stated or too often repeated. The ground

seems won for Humanism in the early years only to be surrendered again. This is the inevitable conclusion on grounds of theory, and the actual conclusion of Infants' and Junior teachers who year by year see their work undone.

To find reinforcements for Humanism at this point we must leave, therefore, the main Elementary School area, though recognising even here certain conquests of the new spirit. We have every right thus to go afield, since National Education is shortly to become something more than a name, and its actualising must mean the recognition of either the new spirit or the old—of either the Humanist ideal of social individuality or the other ideal of mass-conformity. There cannot be a prolongation of the present educational position, which is in fact civil war between these two. There cannot be a national system which accepts Humanism for the years from three to seven, and then for the great majority prescribes an anti-Humanist seven years' drill, while inviting them to supplement or counteract it by sundry voluntary schemes, social or educational, once more of a Humanist character. This inconsistency and chaos we believe will not continue. Will the order and consistency that replace them be Humanist or not? What are the Humanist forces now at work, outside the Elementary area?

They are to be found clearly in the "New School Movement" now gaining recognition in European countries. We shall not be surprised to find in these latest products of our age mainly a reassertion of the Humanism of Plato, of Vittorino, of Pestalozzi, together with some characteristic Twentieth Century applications. Their educational aims

have been summarised, in the year 1914, as follows—

1. Physical Education: Life in the country. Water, air and light in abundance. Manual work obligatory for all: Agriculture, carpentry, gardening, forge. The balance and health of the body regarded as primary condition of the health of the mind.
2. Intellectual Education: Not learning or memory-work imposed from without, but reflection and reasoning acting from within. Beginning with facts and proceeding to ideas. Following the scientific method: observation, hypothesis, verification, law.
3. Moral Education: Not authority exercised from without, but moral liberty creating a personal and social law from within. Gradual freedom from authority won by personal service. Training in initiative, responsibility and self-government.¹

Truly these schools may rely as much on the most ancient witnesses of Humanism as on its latest appeal for interpretation to-day. As to their visible strength, they are still a mere handful, but a quarter of a century ago they were non-existent, and the significant fact is their steady increase. In England, apart from well-known isolated experiments, many of the Friends' Schools, High Schools and Private Schools are rapidly moving towards the same goal, and effecting drastic changes both

¹ Article on *The New School Movement*, by the Head Master of Bedales School. 1914.

in teaching and in discipline, in obedience to a new Humanist awakening. It is all-important that schools of this type should not be weakened or ousted by hard competition with Secondary Schools which are free from financial pressure. If this danger can be averted (it has proved very real in the case of the Girls' Public Day School Trust), it may well be hoped that the older Secondary Schools have still their best national service in front of them and not behind. They are close enough in touch with the Universities on the one hand and the Elementary Schools on the other to be of peculiar value as a medium for transmitting a new Humanism. Without them the newer type of Municipal and County Secondary Schools is so closely linked to the Elementary as to be in danger of prolonging and extending the method and the spirit of the latter, instead of committing itself to that forward movement which we are now tracing.

Abroad, as Mr. Badley points out, the New School Movement has its representatives in many European countries. M. Demolins has conveyed the Abbotsholme principles from England to similar schools in France and Russia, and Dr. Lietz to the dozen Landerziehungsheime of Germany. The generous type of education carried out in all these schools, together with their strong cult of individuality, restricts them at present to a privileged and very small section of the community. But their national value depends on their co-operation and co-ordination with a wider Humanism available for the people as a whole. If they are to remain isolated in privilege and freed from civic and social responsibility they must forfeit their claim to a

place in the Humanist movement of to-day, whose new banner is plainly inscribed "democratic extension."

Following the movement beyond the Elementary School leaving-age, we find reinforcements for Humanism in the work of Continuation Schools, Summer Schools, Adult Schools, and conspicuously in the People's High Schools of Denmark. England's best contributions in this sphere are the Workers' Educational Associations, the Adult School movement, the University Extension, the Women's Co-operative Guild and the Parents' National Educational Union. All these gathering forces must react with cumulative power upon the anti-Humanist qualities of the Elementary Schools. And what Elementary Teachers cannot achieve alone, they may yet achieve by co-operation with these. Also, so far as reform within these schools depends on legislation, it depends on forces like those just enumerated for the creation of the necessary public opinion.

To the most recent of all these wider educational movements, the Council for the Study of International Relations, Humanism must attach a peculiar significance, both in its purpose and in its method. Its aim is "to encourage the study of the national, social, economic, and ethical problems raised by the war." In a single sentence it sums up the main contention of this chapter, that "the great issues raised by the war need an educated democracy for their right solution." It recognises in our emergency, our opportunity. And the salient features of its scheme—small groups of students from all social classes, a network of such groups

all over the country, a broad but well-schemed and regular course of study, and co-operation with like-minded agencies already at work—all these are the features of Humanism for our century. All are calculated to evoke a new national sensitiveness to spiritual fact, and a juster valuation of human life when liberated by fellowship. Such a scheme, if indeed it can triumph, will not only sweep away the dead weight of external opposition which now confronts the progressive teacher and the Humanist school. It will not only transform the environment from alien hostility to friendship. According to its growth and power it will render impossible the reign of dead mechanism and coercion in any educational area, and will require that the more retrograde Schools and Colleges loose their shackles, and that legislation and finance prove adequate ministers of progress.

Finally, Humanism calls to its aid not only the strictly educational forces, but the whole power of the movement for civic and social uplifting. By its very character as life-education it lays claim on all workers in this movement. And they, to-day, are a great and growing army. How is it possible for us in England any longer to view the school as an independent and isolated unit, and education as a thing detachable from the main stream of life, either for the individual or the nation? Infant Care and After-Care, Evening Schools and Adult Schools, Old Scholars' Clubs and social and religious clubs innumerable, Teachers of Humanist mind, paid or unpaid, in school and out of school, school Libraries and public Libraries, school excursions and Country Holiday Funds, changing

methods of discipline slowly winning their way in many Schools, and in the Children's Courts, as well as in pioneer experiments such as the Little Commonwealth and the Junior Republics—are these just so many unrelated accidents of the present day? Or are they stars in the gathering constellation of Humanism, fighting in their courses against a common foe, and by their inner unity of purpose sure of victory?

FOR REFERENCE

FICHTE. *Addresses to the German Nation.*

CLUTTON BROCK. *Thoughts on the War.* Methuen.

SETON-WATSON,

WILSON, ZIMMERN, } *The War and Democracy.* Macmillan.
AND GREENWOOD.

APPENDIX A
[CHAP. II. HUMANIST EDUCATION]
ADDITIONAL NOTES

APPENDIX A

ADDITIONAL NOTES TO CHAPTER II

I. THE following are merely first suggestions for a study that should prove of almost inexhaustible interest, viz. the inter-connection of the various Humanist principles in their application.

Compare, *e. g.* the following groups of tenets and of those Humanists who, in very various periods, combined them and emphasised them.

- | | |
|--|--|
| (i) Care of very young children.
Education of women.
Training of teachers.
Democratic extension of education. | } Erasmus, Comenius,
Mulcaster, Montessori. |
| (ii) Importance of manual work.
Civic and social ideal.
Democratic extension. | } Luther, Pestalozzi,
Montessori,
Kerschensteiner. |
| (iii) Civic and social ideal.
Importance of music.
Supremacy of moral aim. | } Luther,
Grundtvig,
Thring. ¹ |
| (iv) Gentle discipline.
Supremacy of moral aim. | } Erasmus,
Elyot,
Montessori. |
| (v) Freedom.
Goodness.
Activity. | } Rabelais, Rousseau,
Montaigne, Montessori. |

¹ Only the second and third tenets of this group are prominent in Thring's case.

II. The Humanist Principles, and their inter-connection, as illustrated by a modern curriculum.

Manual work.	}	I_b	II_c	III_b
Drawing.				
Gymnastics.		I_a	I_b	
Science.		I_a	I_b	
Hygiene.		I_a	I_b	
Singing.		I_a	I_b	II_c

The recent and very marked development of all these in the Elementary Schools is in response to the Humanist demand for—

- (i) *Balance*—the physical aim having been grossly neglected.
- (ii) *Self-activity and self-expression*.

Note also the increased care for I_c —Environment, but the prolonged want of balance (I_a) through suppression of the moral aim, and the prolonged disregard in England of II_a and II_b , education for citizenship and for government.

APPENDIX B

[CHAP. IX]

THE CARE COMMITTEE SCHEME AS IN OPERATION IN BIRMINGHAM

1. EXPLANATORY STATEMENT
2. SUGGESTIONS FOR HELPERS
3. SUGGESTIONS TO TEACHERS

REPRINTED BY PERMISSION OF THE COMMITTEE

APPENDIX B

THE CARE COMMITTEE SCHEME AS IN OPERATION IN BIRMINGHAM

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

IN July 1911 the City Education Committee set on foot a scheme to help youths and girls when they are leaving school to begin work, and also during their first working years. Its principal objects are to see that as far as possible boys and girls, or their parents for them, make a good choice of employment, and then to influence their industrial progress and improvement.

1.—*The Need for the Scheme.*

About 13,000 boys and girls leave the Elementary Schools of the City every year. The great majority of them are forthwith absorbed by its offices, factories, workshops and warehouses.

The entry into employment or the choice of a career is the most important thing in a lad's (or a girl's) life. Fortunately many parents treat it as such. They observe at home his taste and his talents, they discuss him with the schoolmaster, they get to know as much as they can about the prospects in those branches of industry or commerce for which he seems to have a bent or good qualifications. Then they seize a suitable opening, of which they hear through the School or by their own inquiries.

With these thoughtful and responsible parents the scheme is little concerned, except as good examples to others, and in some cases perhaps to give them just at the right time additional knowledge and a wider choice of openings.

Some other parents would gladly do well by their children, but do not know enough about the different branches of employment. Neither are they aware how to find out what would be best to do.

Others again, and a very numerous class they are, are only concerned for the highest immediate cash return for their children's labour. Pressure of present circumstances is responsible for this in some cases, and in others less creditable considerations.

In cases of this kind, where care and foresight are absent, the youth is left largely to his own resources. He leaves school as soon as he is qualified to do so, he visits the factories in his neighbourhood, or scans the advertisements, or inquires where he sees a "Boy Wanted." What are the results?

1. By the good sense of the boy or by pure chance some turn out quite satisfactorily.
2. Numbers of boys get into "blind alley" jobs. They receive their higher wages for the first few years, are turned out for younger boys, and having neither skill nor ambition drift amongst the casual workers or the unemployed.
3. Others get work which they find they do not like, or for which they have not the required ability or aptitude. They soon leave, and many of them go from job to job, acquiring no progressive skill and losing the capacity for steady employment.

4. Some go to situations for which they are not physically fitted, and for which in some cases the School Medical Inspection has shown them to be positively unfitted. Their health suffers temporarily or permanently, and additions are thus made to the ranks of the unemployable.
5. Others again are without employment for some time after they leave School; these naturally tend to become undisciplined and thereby suffer untold harm.

These considerations and the growing complexity of the industrial life of the City call for some organisation for supplying knowledge to those who seek it, and for offering guidance to those who need it. Some scheme is necessary to substitute system for the present haphazard practices in such an important matter.

2. The Central Care Committee.

The City Education Committee has appointed a special Committee, named the Central Care Committee, to devote its whole attention to the welfare, and primarily the industrial welfare, of youths and girls from the time they leave School until they are seventeen years of age. The Central Care Committee consists of six members of the Education Committee, four representatives of teachers, three of employers, three of workmen, four social workers, the School Medical Officer and others. The Committee carries on its work through two sets of machinery—

1. The Juvenile Employment Exchanges.
2. School Care Committees.

Each of these is necessary to the efficiency of the other; either without the other would be incomplete, hence the advantage of having both working under or in conjunction with one Central Care Committee.

3. *The Juvenile Employment Exchanges.*

The Central Juvenile Employment Exchange is at 201-203 Corporation Street. The Officer in charge has been specially appointed by the Board of Trade on account of his knowledge, training, and consequent fitness for dealing with the employment of juveniles. He attends the meetings of the Central Care Committee and acts in consultation with their Officer.

The chief work of the Exchange is—

1. To receive and register applications for employment from youths and girls under seventeen years of age.
2. To receive and register applications from employers for juvenile employées.
3. To endeavour to place the applicants for employment in the situations for which they are best suited and in which they are likely to be most successful.

The Exchange is in an excellent position for putting the right applicant into the right situation because—

1. The Exchange and the Central Care Committee have already accumulated an immense amount of information about the various trades of the City, and so can advise applicants and their parents what the wages, prospects, and conditions are in any trade. It

can recommend those which will lead to regular and improving work, and warn against bad conditions and prospects.

2. By the time the child applies for a post, the Officers above mentioned will have in their possession a report concerning it from the Head Teacher of its school, from the School Medical Officer, and from the School Care Committee Helper. (See below.)
3. There is such a wide field of choice. From July 1911 to May 1913, 16,348 applications were received from employers, and 10,609 posts were filled.

For the convenience of parents and juvenile applicants five Branch Exchanges have been opened in various parts of the City, and others will probably be opened in other districts as the work develops.

4. *School Care Committees.*

The Scheme provides for the appointment of a School Care Committee for each Elementary School in the City. Many individual schools have their own Care Committees. In a number of cases it has been found advisable, at any rate for the present, to group several neighbouring Schools under one Care Committee. These Committees consist of School Managers, Teachers, and others who are prepared to interest themselves actively in boys and girls. The members are assigned as "Helpers" to a small number of children each. The Helper is put in touch with the boys or girls

about three months before they leave school, and at once tries to set up a friendly relationship with the parents as well as with the children by visits to the homes or by other means. The latter are encouraged to talk about what they would like to be, the parents about what they have in view. When there are vague or unsuitable proposals for a child's employment, or no plans at all, the parents and the child are urged to attend at the Juvenile Employment Exchange, and thereby to find out the best available post for which the child is suited. To rouse where dormant the sense of parental responsibility, to lead the willing and well-meaning but uninformed parents to industrial knowledge and right action, to encourage the choice of skilled employment rather than that with no prospect for the boy to become a man—these are amongst the Helper's aims on the industrial side, and the Employment Exchanges provide the means of giving effect to the School Care Committee's work.

The Helper endeavours to keep in touch with the boy or girl for about three years if necessary. This as regards employment is advisable to counteract the aimless drifting or the capricious change from job to job, to give encouragement to face and overcome difficulties, to see that if changes are advisable they are made for the youth's benefit and do not give rise to intervals of disastrous unemployment.

The conditions under which juveniles are employed are in some places and in some trades not satisfactory, and have a bad effect morally or physically, or both. As fuller and more exact information is accumulated by the Central Care

Committee, through the operations of the School Care Committees and the Juvenile Employment Exchanges, much can doubtless be done to improve the conditions.

5. *Further Education and Kindred Influences.*

The Helper takes an interest, and stimulates the parents' interest too, in the further education of the boys and girls. They are urged, *where the hours of work allow*, to join classes at the Technical Schools, Schools of Art, Evening Continuation Schools, or at such institutions as may be most suitable to the individual cases. The School Care Committees are in touch with these classes, and the Helper can readily learn the degree of regularity and progress in any case, and can act accordingly with the youth and the parents.

Some School Care Committees will concern themselves with the means of recreation and innocent relaxation, and will assist with Boys' or Girls Clubs, Old Scholars' Associations, and the like, or will encourage youths and girls to join other organisations calculated to be to their good.

Again, meetings of parents will be held from time to time, such as have already been organised by several School Care Committees; also meetings of boys and girls about to leave school or who have recently left. These meetings are found to be valuable means of rousing interest in the future well-being of the children.

In these and many other ways the School Care Committees will be able to take a hand in the betterment of the youth of the City—in their mental, moral and physical betterment.

6. *Co-operation with Existing Organisations.*

The Central Care Committee are anxious to have the co-operation of all organisations already at work for the good of boys and girls, and of any organised body of adults which takes an interest in juveniles. The Committee wish to give the first option of becoming the Helper for any boy or girl to the person who is already associated with the child in a definite capacity, *i. e.* as Scouts, Boys' Brigade, or Church Lads' Brigade Officer, Sunday School Teacher, Juvenile Friendly Society's Officer, Club Leader, etc. etc. This will involve little extra work, but adds a very important phase of interest to the relationship already existing, and furthermore so far as this particular interest is concerned gives the Helper the authority of the Education Committee to approach the parents. The far-reaching possibilities for good have strongly appealed to the various organisations already invited to assist. Their help has been readily promised, and in most cases where School Care Committees have been formed has been given with enthusiasm. It is most important that overlapping of effort should be avoided, and the co-operation of existing organisations is all the more valuable on that account.

7. *More Helpers Wanted.*

There are, however, many children who belong to no organisation at all, and for these other helpers are needed. Generally speaking, they are of the class most in need of after-care. The scheme has been received with general favour, but its ultimate success must depend on the number and quality of

Helpers available, and on their perseverance with the work. Ladies and gentlemen who feel moved to help are earnestly invited to send their names and addresses to the Central Care Department, Education Office, Margaret Street, and specify, if they have a preference, with what School they would like to be associated.

It is a new work, and therefore all Helpers have to gain their experience. Those who have already engaged in other branches of social work will naturally find that experience of great value, but none need decline the present opportunity of service on the ground of inexperience alone. Means are available for informing prospective Helpers more exactly than is done herein what their duties would be, and how best to discharge them. Inquiries on this subject will be welcomed.

Several excellent Care Committees for Schools in the central and poorer districts have been formed almost entirely by men and women from the suburban and residential quarters of the City. There is scope for more to be done on the same lines.

Equally good service is being rendered by numbers of working men—especially members of Adult Schools, the Church of England Men's Society, by the co-operation of the Trades Council, and through other organisations.

The School Care Committees which have so far reported on their work are unanimous in their testimony that parents generally welcome the Helpers and greatly appreciate the interest taken in their children's welfare.

SUGGESTIONS FOR HELPERS

The objects of the Birmingham system of Juvenile Employment Bureaux and School Care Committees are—

1. To point out the advantages of skilled trades.
2. To advocate the use of the Juvenile Employment Exchange.
3. To discourage unnecessary change of work.
4. To encourage attendance at Evening Classes or some other form of continued education.
5. To stimulate thrift.

Each Helper will be asked by the School Care Committee to undertake to see a certain number of children who will shortly be leaving school, and to keep in touch with them afterwards.

A Helper who is running a club or brigade, or who is in touch with boys and girls through some definite organisation, will only be asked to look after those children with whom he is connected.

It may be possible to interview the child at school or in the club, etc., but probably a friendly visit to the home will form the best introduction. The Helper should explain the deep interest the Committee feel in the children who will so soon be starting work, and its anxiety that they should do as well in their work as they have done at school. This will lead to a question as to whether there are any plans for the child's future. If there are not, or they seem undesirable, the Helper should, if possible, give some information as to good trades,

recommending the parents and child to go and consult the Juvenile Employment Exchange official at the nearest Juvenile Office some weeks before the child leaves school. Probably the Helper would arrange to meet them at the office at a specified time.

It is very important that parents should be made to feel that any visit to the home is the outcome of a desire to be really helpful and friendly, and that they should not get even the impression that mere curiosity or inquisitiveness has anything to do with it.

The Helper would find it essential to see the teacher's report as to the child's School career and character, but should be very careful to preserve the strictly confidential character of the report.

The business of the Helper should not be to assume the responsibility for placing the child, but to help in the choice, and to second the often desirable efforts of the parents. Any information as to home conditions which may make one trade more suitable than another should be carefully recorded, and also the preferences and ambitions of the child.

In advising a child, notice should be taken of the child's health and physical condition. Helpers may be asked from time to time to take their turn in attending at the office during the hours that it is open for applications, and to assist in interviewing the parents and children. When the child is placed, if possible a promise should be obtained that if for any reasons there are difficulties, or the place is not liked, the Helper should be acquainted before notice to leave is given.

This may serve as a means of explaining the great undesirability of constantly moving from place to place, and of stimulating the child to face difficulties which often may be incidental to learning a good trade.

The child should be advised to continue the education begun at School by attending a Technical or Continuation School, or Trade Classes.

If circumstances make this impossible, in many cases it will be well to advise joining a girls' or boys' Club, and the Helper should be acquainted with all these in the neighbourhood, with the nights of meeting and subjects taught, as well as with particulars of the Continuation Schools. This information will always, it is hoped, be procurable from the School Care Committee Secretary.

It may also be desirable to urge that the child begin to save, if only one penny per week, so that the habit may be formed, and some consideration given as to how the money earned may best be spent. To save for a holiday or clothes may be an inducement for not wasting the pocket money, especially to save for the extra clothes that may be necessary to commence work at a good place.

The Helper should be acquainted with the places in the neighbourhood where there are penny banks, which may lead on to the Post Office Savings Bank.

As in many cases visits to the homes will be made before the children leave School, care should be taken not to give or countenance the idea that they may leave before they are qualified to do so.

The Helper should endeavour to keep in effective touch with the girl or boy, and will be asked to

report to the School Care Committee at least twice a year as to progress.

List of Exchanges

The following Exchanges are open Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, from 9 a.m. to 3 p.m.; Friday, 9 a.m. to 8 p.m.; Saturday, 9 a.m. to 12 noon—

Central Exchange, 201-203 Corporation Street; Jewellers' Branch, 85-86 Great Hampton Street; South Branch, 408 Stratford Road; Handsworth Branch, 198 Soho Road; Selly Oak Branch, 177-181 High Street, Selly Oak; Aston Branch, 10 Witton Lane.

There is also a Branch at the Women's Settlement, 318 Summer Lane—Boys, Tuesdays, 7-45 p.m. to 8-45 p.m.; Girls, Wednesdays, 7-45 p.m. to 8-45 p.m.

The experience now gained shows that Helpers will assist very much the efficient working of the Scheme if they will be good enough to note particularly the following points—

1. A child is generally assigned to a Helper about three months before it is expected to leave School.
2. The Helper is asked to hand in the first report on the case at the next meeting of the Committee. If this is inconvenient the report should be presented at a meeting or sent to the Honorary Secretary at least a month before the child is expected to leave School.

3. If there is any difficulty in filling in any part of the report, such part may be left for a subsequent report. In these instances Helpers are urged not to delay making their first report because the information is incomplete. It is most important that Helpers should exercise a right influence as to employment before the child leaves School, and Helpers should be careful not to lessen their influence merely to get information for the report cards.
4. It is desirable that the Helper should be in close touch with the child and parents at the time the child actually leaves School to begin work, otherwise previous effort may be wasted. As soon as the child is definitely fixed in a situation a further report should be made on the Helper's Report Card, which will be returned to the Helper by the Honorary Secretary for the purpose.
5. The Helper should make notes of all visits or interviews in the notebook provided, and at intervals of about six months should make further reports on the cards. These again will be sent out by the Honorary Secretary for the purpose. If a child changes work it is well to make a report at once.
6. If a Helper in any case forms the opinion that no further after-care is necessary, he should report accordingly to the Honorary Secretary of the Care Committee, when, if the Committee agree, the case may be cancelled.

7. Helpers are urged to regard the Juvenile Employment Exchanges as essential parts of the Scheme, as they indeed are. The Officers in charge will welcome Helpers at the Exchange, will be pleased to give the fullest information they have on various trades, to interview parents and children, and co-operate with the Care Committees in every possible way.

SUGGESTIONS TO TEACHERS

The Scheme for the establishment of School Care Committees to work in conjunction with the Juvenile Employment Exchange is being gradually developed, and such Committees have been or are being formed for upwards of sixty Schools.

The principal functions of a School Care Committee are to keep in effective touch in cases where it appears desirable to do so with children from the time shortly prior to their leaving School until they reach seventeen years of age; to advise and assist where necessary in obtaining suitable employment for them, for which purpose the Committee's Juvenile Employment Exchange and Branches will be available; to influence them in the direction of progress in their trade or calling; to secure their further education by their attendance at suitable Evening Schools or Classes, and generally to take an interest in their moral, physical, educational, and industrial welfare.

As was anticipated, these objects have secured the hearty and active approval of teachers where

Care Committees have been established. The Central Care Committee now proposes to proceed with the formation of Care Committees at other suitable Schools, and a cordial invitation is given to all teachers to assist in the work.

In setting up these Committees, care has been taken to enlist the sympathy and co-operation of the social organisations in the various districts, so that in nearly every case the Care Committees have been formed from or in connection with existing bodies of social workers.

Many Head Teachers have signified their willingness to serve upon the Care Committees, and a cordial invitation is extended to all teachers to assist in the work by joining the Committee attached to their own School.

It is hoped that those who are connected with old pupils' clubs or school athletics, or have had experience in placing boys in suitable situations, will give the Committees the benefit of their advice and assistance.

The Central Care Committee further desires the co-operation of the teachers in supplying information concerning the scholars. It is obviously impossible to render efficient assistance to a boy or girl unless the school career and character of the child are known to those advising it.

In order to minimise the clerical work, cards will be sent to each School, and it is hoped that one will be filled in for each child about to leave School. To carry out the Committee's scheme properly it is necessary that the Report Card should reach the Education Office at least three months before the child is expected to leave School.

The Committee hopes, in the course of time, to accumulate valuable statistics and information concerning children leaving School, and what becomes of them, and hence it is necessary to ask Head Teachers to send in a Report concerning all children leaving School, whether they are such as may require after-care or not.

It is desirable that the teachers' general report should note the intelligence, reliability, regularity, and thoroughness of the child, and that the marks V.G., G., etc., should be avoided.

If a child has any special aptitude, such should be stated; often a child, slow at ordinary lessons, is very skilful with his fingers. The knowledge of this, or similar facts, will be of great value to the Committee. If the child has been in receipt of free breakfasts or Parish relief, mark "F.B.," or "P.R." after "other information."

This is only required so as to save unnecessary labour and overlapping, since all the facts regarding the family circumstances of these children are already available.

In addition to this, each child should be supplied with a School Record Card on leaving School.

Even in Schools to which no Care Committee is attached, the children, when leaving, should be strongly recommended to enter their names at the Juvenile Employment Exchange nearest to the School.

The Central Care Committee hopes that the teachers will do all they can with scholars, parents, and employers to advertise the Scheme.

As parents and employers see the value of a wider outlook and a further field of choice, it is antici-

pated that it will become the rule, and not the exception, for scholars to be placed in situations through the agency of the Care Committees and the Employment Exchange.

The Central Care Committee will devote much attention to the continuance of the education of boys and girls after they leave the Day Schools. It is hoped that Head Teachers will do all in their power to influence boys and girls to this end, and space has been provided on the Teacher's Report Card for the insertion of the name of the Evening School or Classes in cases where children give a promise to join.

Details as to meetings of the Committee will be supplied separately.

INDEX

A

- Ablett, 161
 Adaptability, xii, 26, 57-71
 Adolescence, xii, 83, 84
 Adult Schools, 96, 219, 301, 302
 Aristotle, 31, 33, 41, 44, 111, 166
 Arithmetic, 130-136
 Arnold, Matthew, 109
 Arnold, Thomas, 35, 182, 204
 Ascham, 36, 48, 50, 85, 141, 203

B

- Barnett, 79, 134, 139, 145, 161
 Baron, Barclay, 75-76, 88-89
 Bell, 105, 106
 Bell, Lady, 113, 231
 Bray, 207, 208, 235, 241, 243, 263

C

- Care Committee, 11, 96, 215, 225, 259, 260, 278, 311-328
 Chantry School, 170
 Character, 33-36, 181-211
 Charity Organisation Society, 259
 Cinematograph, 92, 218-227
 Citizenship, 27, 41-43, 188, 201, 205, 207, 208, 266, 281, 297
 Civics, 149, 206, 207, 241, 242, 244

- Classes, size of, 12-14, 17, 28, 49-50, 80-81, 105, 106, 109, 110, 157, 158, 176, 195, 203, 244, 246, 275, 287, 288, 291-294
 Clifton College, 206
 Clubs, 90, 96, 232-234, 243, 318, 326
 Comenius, 35, 37, 42, 45, 48, 50, 123, 166, 172
 Competition, 196-197, 249-252
 Comte, 43, 50, 51, 284
 Continuation Schools, 94, 253-254, 263-267
 Co-operation, 251-252
 Courts, Children's, 89, 183, 204

D

- Dancing, 89-90
 Democracy, ix, 44, 45, 51, 272-274, 282, 301
 Denmark, 42, 275, 301
 Detention Colony, 243
 Dewey, Professor, 43, 45, 188, 207, 281
 Discipline, 28, 48-49, 193-205
 Dramatisation, 146-147
 Drawing, 161-165, 236
 Drill, 85-86, 155-156
 Drudgery, 60-67, 198

E

- Educational Needlecraft, 157
 Elyot, 40, 48, 50, 172, 203, 204

English, 137-144
 Environment, 26, 29, 39, 40
 Erasmus, 33, 42, 48, 50
 Eugenics, 258
 Eurhythmics, 86, 112
 Evening Schools, 238, 264

F

Factory Acts, 257
 Fichte, 42, 271
 Folk Song, 174
 Freeman, 227, 235
 Froebel, 37, 38, 39, 45, 48, 87,
 91, 92

G

Games, 85-89
 Geography, 150-153
 Gorst, 80, 81, 242, 244, 263
 Grammar, 143
 Grundtvig, 38, 42, 51, 173
 Guarino, 23
 Guilds of Help, 225, 259, 267

H

Habit, 63, 64, 184-185, 207
 Hall, Stanley, 80, 82, 86, 87,
 88, 89
 Head Teachers' Conference,
 222
 Health, 75-99
 Health Visitor, 96
 Herbart, 35, 37, 39, 192
 History, 145-149
 Holidays, 240-241
 Holmes, Edmond, 9, 45, 108
 Home, 241-246, 259
 Humanism, 23-54, 307-308
 and *passim*
 Hygiene, 93, 155

I

Individuality, 27-28, 281, 285,
 297
 Interest, 26, 48, 93, 123, 125,
 181-211

J

James, William, 63, 184
 Junior Republic, 201, 205, 303

K

Kappa, 150
 Kerschensteiner, 51, 187, 206,
 208, 210, 264, 266, 285,
 286
 Key, Ellen, 46, 57, 58

L

Labour Exchange, 8, 257, 260,
 261, 263, 311-328
 Lancaster, 105, 106
 La Salle, 45
 Laurie, 22, 181
 Leaving Age, 18, 19, 51, 81,
 93, 264-265, 288
 Legge, 169
 Leisure, 88, 215-246, 254, 279
 Libraries, 113, 141, 229-231
 Literature, 141, 145
 Little Commonwealth, 200,
 201-203, 205, 303
 Luther, 35, 45, 172, 288

M

MacMunn, 69, 192
 Magnus, Sir Philip, 57, 58,
 167
 Manual Work, 84, 166-169,
 196, 236-237
 Milton, 43
 Mitchell, 197
 Monroe, 171, 203
 Montaigne, 37, 42, 50
 Montessori, 37, 40, 45, 46, 47,
 48, 82, 84, 125, 127, 293,
 297
 Moral Education League, 186,
 188
 Moral Instruction, 185-191,
 207
 Mulcaster, 23, 28, 45, 48, 50,
 89, 115, 201, 244

Music, 33, 85, 86, 170-175,
235-236

N

National Union of Teachers,
13-14, 110
Nature Study, 154, 162
Needlework, 157-160, 280
Neighbourhood Clubs, 243
Nettleship, 91, 185, 198

O

Oxford, 115

P

Parents, 242-246, 263, 301
Paterson, 7, 244
Patrols, 8, 9
Peace, 197, 208-209, 271-
272, 282
Pestalozzi, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40,
42, 45, 48
Pett Ridge, 219
Plato, 31, 33, 40, 41, 43, 44,
46, 48, 50, 91, 110, 111,
166, 171, 298
Play, 85-88, 194
Plutarch, 170
Poverty (Rowntree), 95, 252
Prideaux, 164, 167
Prizes, 196
Public-houses, 227
Public Schools, 294-296

Q

Quintilian, 41

R

Rabelais, 34, 37, 38, 50, 166,
172
Reading, 119-125

Religion, 52, 106-108, 191
Rhythm, 26, 86, 90-92
Rousseau, 37, 42, 45, 47

S

Salaries, 14, 287-288
Science, 154-156
Sectarianism, 189, 233
Sex-hygiene, 94-95
Socrates, 35, 46
Specialisation, 265, 285

T

Thring, 35, 40, 50, 170, 172
Training College, 193, 284-
288, 292

U

Unemployment, 252-254
United Girls' Schools Mission,
206
United States, 45
Universities, xii, 115, 296
Unskilled labour, 65, 66, 253
Utility, 111, 251

V

Vittorino da Feltre, 3, 39, 41,
48, 52, 172, 181, 203, 285,
298
Vocational Training, 176, 265-
267

W

Wages, 66
Welfare Workers, 261-263
White Ribbon Bands, 225
Workers' Educational Asso-
ciation, 96, 301
Writing, 126-129

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
RICHARD CLAY & SONS, LIMITED,
BRUNSWICK ST., STAMFORD ST., S. E. 1,
AND BUNGAY SUFFOLK

